



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 145 • NUMBER 120 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, January 31, 2011

—

Speaker: The Honourable Peter Milliken

CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, January 31, 2011

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1100)

[*English*]

ECONOMIC ACTION PLAN

Hon. Ted Menzies (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour this morning to table, in both official languages, the seventh report on Canada's economic action plan.

The Speaker: It being 11:03 a.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

PATENT ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-393, An Act to amend the Patent Act (drugs for international humanitarian purposes) and to make a consequential amendment to another Act, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

[*English*]

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: There are three motions in amendment standing on the notice paper for the report stage of Bill C-393. Motions Nos. 1 to 3 will be grouped for debate and voted upon according to the voting pattern available at the table.

[*Translation*]

I will now put Motions Nos. 1 to 3 to the House.

• (1105)

[*English*]

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-393 be amended by restoring Clause 2 as follows:

"2. Section 21.02 of the Act is replaced by the following:

21.02 The definitions in this section apply in sections 21.01 to 21.16.

"authorization" means an authorization granted under subsection 21.04(1).

"pharmaceutical product" means any drug, as defined in section 2 of the Food and Drugs Act, and includes monitoring products and products used in conjunction with a pharmaceutical product."

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-393 be amended by restoring Clause 4 as follows:

"4. (1) Subsection 21.04(1) of the Act is replaced by the following:

21.04 (1) Subject to subsections (3) and (4), the Commissioner shall, on the application of any person and on the payment of the prescribed fee, authorize the person to

- (a) manufacture the pharmaceutical product or products named in the application;
- (b) make, construct and use any patented invention solely for the purpose of manufacturing the product or products; and
- (c) sell the product or products for export to a country that is listed in the Schedule.

(1.1) In addition to what is authorized under subsection (1), an authorization under that subsection authorizes the person to

- (a) manufacture any active ingredient used in the manufacture of a finished product; and
- (b) make, construct and use any patented invention solely for the purpose of manufacturing any active pharmaceutical ingredient used in the manufacture of a finished product.

(1.2) If a country is removed from the Schedule an authorization continues to apply with respect to that country for 30 days as though that country had not been removed from the Schedule.

(2) Subsection 21.04(2) of the Act is amended by adding "and" at the end of paragraph (a) and by repealing paragraphs (b) to (f).

(3) Subsection 21.04(3) of the Act is replaced by the following:

(3) The Commissioner shall grant an authorization only if the applicant has complied with the prescribed requirements."

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Malo (Verchères—Les Patriotes, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-393 be amended by adding after line 22 on page 3 the following new clause:

"18. (1) The provisions of this Act that amend the Patent Act shall cease to apply on the day that is the fourth anniversary of the day on which this Act comes into force unless, before that day, the application of those provisions is extended by a resolution—the text of which is established under subsection (2)—passed by both Houses of Parliament in accordance with the rules set out in subsection (3).

(2) The Governor in Council may, by order, establish the text of a resolution providing for the extension of the application of the provisions that amend the Patent Act referred to in subsection (1) and specifying the period of the extension, which may not exceed five years from the first day on which the resolution has been passed by both Houses of Parliament.

(3) A motion for the adoption of the resolution may be debated in both Houses of Parliament but may not be amended. At the conclusion of the debate, the Speaker of each House of Parliament shall immediately put every question necessary to determine whether or not the motion is concurred in.

(4) The application of the provisions that amend the Patent Act referred to in subsection (1) may be further extended in accordance with the procedure set out in this section.

Private Members' Business

(5) In the event that the provisions that amend the Patent Act referred to in subsection (1) cease to apply, applications that have been granted an authorization under section 21.04 of that Act shall be concluded if they were submitted before the day on which those provisions cease to apply.”

[English]

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, every day, over 16,000 lives are lost in the world to HIV, tuberculosis, malaria and other treatable infectious diseases, according to the Global Fund.

In 2009, 33.3 million people around the world were living with HIV-AIDS, 1.8 million of them died from the infection and 260,000 of those people were children. Ninety-seven percent of people infected with HIV-AIDS live in low to middle wealth countries, and while almost 15 million infected in these countries were in need of antiviral drugs, only 5.2 million were treated.

I am pleased to speak to Bill C-393, which would fix key flaws in Canada's Access to Medicine Regime, CAMR. I have eagerly been awaiting this opportunity because Bill C-393 is a bill that I talk about a lot with my constituents in Halifax. I get letters and phone calls about CAMR. I have been to events around Nova Scotia, like the grandmothers' event, Good Words for Africa-A Scrabble Afternoon, which is a scrabble fundraiser to raise money for HIV-AIDS and to raise awareness of Bill C-393.

I get postcards from the grandmothers to grandmothers campaign. I have received letters from the HIV-AIDS Legal Network. I am a member of the all party HIV-AIDS and TB caucus, or the HAT caucus, where I have listened to Stephen Lewis and James Orbinski talk about Bill C-393. I have received Facebook messages and tweets. I have been stopped on the streets. I have talked to students, doctors, community activists, retired politicians, health policy experts and grandmother after grandmother about this legislation. They have all said the same thing, which is to support Bill C-393 in its original form.

One letter I received was from the international NGO, OXFAM. I would like to read this letter to my colleagues in the House because it effectively communicates everything we need to know about this bill. It reads:

Dear Member of Parliament,

You have an amazing opportunity right 2at would save lives around the world, without costing Canadian taxpayers a dime.

In many places in the world, countless people are dying every day of AIDS, Tuberculosis, Malaria and a host of other diseases.

But these deaths are preventable. What these countries need is access to generic medications.

The good news is: The political will exists to ensure this access. In 2004, Parliament unanimously passed legislation creating Canada's Access to Medicines Regime (CAMR).

The bad news is: CAMR is broken.

As the legislation functions now, generic drug manufacturers are required to negotiate with patent holders on a country-by-country and drug-by-drug basis, before they are able to distribute affordable life saving medicines. Due to this complexity and difficulty of use, CAMR has been deemed unworkable in its present form.

In more than six years, CAMR has resulted in only one order of one AIDS drug to one country.

But wait! There is more good news: Bill C-393—in its original form—would solve this problem. It contains a one-licence-solution, which would eliminate the need for separate negotiations with patent-holders for each purchasing country and each order of medicines. It would provide a more workable process to get affordable medicines for people in developing countries. And it would do all of this while meeting every one of Canada's international legal obligations, including WTO rules.

Please commit to voting to restore the “one-licence” solution to Bill C-393.

You will be directly responsible for saving lives.

Thank you.

As I said, this is a letter that many of my colleagues in the House would have received from OXFAM. It does not get any simpler than that. As members of Parliament, as representatives of our communities, we could be directly responsible for saving lives. Or, we could all be implicated in Canada's refusal to help and watch by the sidelines as more and more people die. It is up to each and every one of us in this House to make a decision about what side of this issue we are on.

CAMR is not working now but reforms can make it work. As we have heard, CAMR has only delivered one medicine to one country since Parliament created it more than six years ago. There is no expectation that CAMR will be used again, unless it gets fixed.

● (1110)

Médecins sans frontières, Doctors Without Borders, testified before committee that it tried for months to make use of CAMR to get medicines for patients but, ultimately, it abandoned this effort because of unnecessary hurdles in the law. Only one generic drug manufacturer has been willing to use CAMR and said that it would not try this process again. However, it has publicly committed to using the system again if it were simplified to make a version of an AIDS drug that is needed to treat children with HIV, a drug that is not currently available from any other source.

Streamlining CAMR does not jeopardize pharmaceutical research and development, including here in Canada. CAMR only authorizes exports of generic versions of patented medicines to certain eligible countries and these countries were already agreed upon by Canada and all WTO members in 2003 and are already reflected in the current CAMR as it was created by Parliament in 2004.

These countries represent a very small portion of the total global pharmaceutical sales and profits of brand name pharmaceutical companies. Further, the brand name drug companies are entitled to receive royalties on sales of generic medicines supplied to these countries under CAMR.

Private Members' Business

Bill C-393's proposed reforms offer value for money for Canadians. These changes cost taxpayers nothing. In fact, Bill C-393's one-licence solution would make Canadian foreign aid more effective because limited resources could be used to purchase more medicines and would also free up scarce resources to invest in making health systems stronger. Scaling up access to treatment also means greater opportunities for producing and distributing good quality, Canadian-made generic medicines, meaning more business and more jobs in addressing a pressing global health need.

We are here today debating amendments that I have introduced at report stage. We have had to introduce these amendments because Conservative and Liberal members of the industry committee worked together to strip some of the most critical aspects from the CAMR legislation, like the one-licence solution.

We have heard criticism about this bill and we are willing to compromise. We are willing to work with parties to reach across the House and work together to ensure this important legislation passes. We have brought forward only two amendments in an effort to make Parliament work and get this legislation passed.

However, at the core of Bill C-393 is and should continue to be the one-licence solution. This approach would eliminate CAMR's current requirement for separate negotiations with patent-holding pharmaceutical companies for individual licences for each country and each order of medicines.

It would also remove the requirement to determine and disclose in advance of even being able to apply for a licence to export a single recipient country and a fixed maximum quantity of medicines. These unnecessary requirements have been proven to be the major stumbling blocks to the use of CAMR. The one-licence solution was removed by committee by a slim majority when it deleted clause 4 of Bill C-393 in spite of the fact that it had clear support at second reading.

Canadians want Parliament to take action on the Canadian access to medicines regime. According to a national poll, 80% of Canadians support reforming Canada's Access to Medicines Regime to make it more workable so that we can help developing countries get access to affordable and life-saving medicines. Dozens of prominent Canadians have come on board to say that this is the way we should be moving, including the former prime minister whose government enacted CAMR.

In honour of World AIDS Day, a group of prominent Canadians wrote a letter to members of Parliament asking them to support Bill C-393. Some of the signatories to this letter included: the right hon. Paul Martin, the former prime minister of Canada; Janice Alton, national co-chair, Canadian Voice of Women for Peace; Richard Bedell, medical advisor for Dignitas; Nigel Fisher, president and CEO of UNICEF; Robert Fox, executive director of Oxfam; Michael Geist, Canada Research chair of Internet and E-commerce Law at the University of Ottawa; Karen Kain, artistic director at the National Ballet of Canada; Alexa McDonough, former member of Parliament; Steve Morgan, researcher at the University of British Columbia; and David Suzuki, Companion of the Order of Canada. As members can see, there are pages and pages of signatories.

Canadians want this legislation to pass and they want all parliamentarians to work together to ensure it passes. I hope every member will stand and vote for these amendments and support Bill C-393.

●(1115)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Malo (Verchères—Les Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is my turn, after the member for Halifax, to speak to Bill C-393, which would amend Canada's access to medicines regime. Before I speak directly about Motions Nos. 1 and 2 moved by the member for Halifax and Motion No. 3, which I moved, I would like to talk about the study we did in parliamentary committee.

When the parliamentary committee was studying this bill, I informed the committee chair that it would be important to take a closer look at Canada's access to medicines regime because it had been used only one time. We wondered why this regime, which was meant to provide ongoing access to medicines, particularly antiretrovirals, for African countries and all disadvantaged countries, was used only once and what kinds of changes would have to be made to it. More generally, how could we change how the different partners involved in this regime acted so that it was used more? Some witnesses told us that the regime worked, yet many people had used it only once. My colleague spoke about groups that had written to her and that came to tell us in committee that they would like to see the regime used more.

I told the committee chair that we needed to hear as many witnesses as possible and that the study needed to be broadened to include the entire regime, not just the bill that had been introduced by the former member for Winnipeg North. The study began and we heard from many witnesses. Unfortunately, I did not get the feeling that my colleagues around the table wanted to go beyond the bill and study Canada's access to medicines regime in its entirety.

When it comes down to it, all members of the House should hope that a regime put in place by Parliament in 2004 is used and that countries in need of low-cost medications have greater access to them, especially when witnesses told the committee that, in the case of antiretroviral drugs, many of these disadvantaged countries need access to second- or even third-generation drugs, which are not currently available in generic form.

This is why it was important to go beyond the bill and study the regime. However, because other members clearly refused to do so, we had to stick to Bill C-393 and study its merits, hence the analysis of the various motions before us.

As the member for Halifax mentioned, the Bloc members who sit on the committee voted in favour of all of Bill C-393's clauses, including those that referred to the one-licence solution.

Private Members' Business

•(1120)

Basically, when examining a bill like Bill C-393, we need to look at what it is all about and what is at the core of the bill. When we looked at Bill C-393, it was clear that its key element was the one-lit licence solution, which is why the hon. member for Halifax had to reintroduce that element. Motions Nos. 1 and 2 reintroduce clauses that the Bloc Québécois has already voted to support.

Now I would like to move Motion No. 3, which I had placed on the order paper on December 15, 2010, and which is in fact a sunset clause. I will not take the time to reread the motion, since the Speaker already read it when introducing the motions under consideration.

Why do we feel that a sunset clause is necessary? Quite simply, to sum everything up and to connect, in a way, all of the testimony we heard in committee. Many witnesses said they wanted to improve access to medications, that is, facilitate the sale and production of drugs in order to make them more accessible, which is what Bill C-393 is all about. Keeping this bill intact would serve to address the concerns expressed by this group of witnesses, since the sunset clause would not affect the other clauses of the bill.

Witnesses also pointed out that by changing Canada's access to medicines regime, Bill C-393 might be in violation of WTO rules. No one in the House would want to introduce or enact legislation that would violate WTO rules. In fact, Canada is calling on its trade partners around the world to comply with these very rules; we therefore would not want the legislation we are passing to violate those rules.

What is more, some fear that the changes made to the regime will simply make it a vehicle for exporting drugs on a large scale, which is inconsistent with the very spirit of this humanitarian regime. They fear that the fundamental purpose of the regime—to provide help—will be lost, and they want the regime's core purpose, namely to aid countries in need of inexpensive drugs, to be preserved.

Officials told us that nothing would change and that even amending the regime through Bill C-393 would change nothing. There need to be concrete examples and facts proving that Bill C-393 can indeed work and that the regime it is amending is an effective regime that is not breaking any rules.

The purpose of the sunset clause is simply to reassure everyone and to ensure that when the four years are up, we have solid examples and can resume the debate calmly with much more on the table than just the example of Rwanda with the current regime. Then in the House and in committee, we can base our discussions on reality, on concrete evidence and on the advances that will have been made through the changes Bill C-393 is making to Canada's access to medicines regime.

•(1125)

[*English*]

Mr. Mike Wallace (Burlington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome back everybody to the House after the Christmas break. I am very happy to back.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss Bill C-393, An Act to amend the Patent Act (drugs for international humanitarian

purposes) and to make a consequential amendment to another Act, and to address the motions that some of my colleagues have put forward to amend the bill at report stage. However, before I discuss Bill C-393 and the motions, I will take a few minutes to highlight Canada's commitment to improving the health conditions of people living in the developing world. This will provide important context given that the laudable goal behind Bill C-393 is to improve the access to medicines in developing countries.

I am sure I can speak for all hon. members in expressing support for this excellent humanitarian goal. However, in my opinion, the most effective way to improve the poor health conditions of people living in the developing world is not by changing Canada's Access to Medicines Regime, as Bill C-393 and other motions today propose to do, but by helping to ensure that primary health care for the world's most vulnerable citizens, the mothers and their children, are being met.

As a result, I stand proudly behind the recent announcement by Prime Minister Harper—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): I remind the member, and all hon. members, that they ought not to refer to their colleagues by their given names.

Mr. Mike Wallace: Mr. Speaker, Canada will provide support to improve maternal and child health care to several developing countries as part of its five-year commitment to the Muskoka initiative. As part of this initiative, Canada will provide support to improve the nutrition and health of three million pregnant and nursing women and their children in Ethiopia.

In addition, the government will strengthen the national health system in Mozambique to develop health services for mothers and children, providing life-saving HIV treatment to 38,000 children, treating 94,000 pregnant women and preventing HIV infections, and immunizing 2.8 million children over the age of five against measles.

Canada's support will also help to strengthen maternal and neonatal health services in Bangladesh through the purchase of essential drugs and equipment; the recruiting and training of health care professionals, including 2,000 new skilled community birth attendants; the upgrading of existing treatment centres; and by helping to purchase enough oral polio vaccine for 250,000 children annually.

I will now turn to discussing my concerns with Bill C-393, followed by the motions before us today at report stage.

I would like to remind the House that this is not the first time I have stood up to speak to this bill. I spoke to it before it went to committee. I actually supported it going to committee so we could hear the discussions. I want to thank my colleague from the Bloc, who attended those meetings and provided valuable input.

Private Members' Business

In October 2010, as we all recall, Bill C-393 underwent an extensive review by the House of Commons Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology, a committee of which I am a member. I would like to congratulate the members of the committee for their commitment to hearing testimony from a wide array of witnesses. Among those who shared their views on the access to medicines initiative for the developing world were experts in the field of international trade and patent law, representatives of non-governmental organizations with experience working in Africa, and government officials with knowledge of the historical background and technical implications of Canada's access to medicines regime.

Through this extensive testimony, the committee was well informed of the international drug procurement framework and trade obligations within which Canada's access to medicines regime must operate.

The committee also heard that Canada's access to medicines regime is only one element of the government's plan to improve health outcomes in developing countries, and that Canada is active in supporting programs like the Muskoka initiative on maternal and child health, which will have a significant effect on improving health conditions in poor countries.

The committee also heard evidence that there is a large economic context to providing affordable health care, including drugs, to low income countries, and that poverty, not patents, is the major obstacle to health access in developing countries.

Finally, the committee heard that Canada's access to medicines regime is working in its current form. The two shipments of 15,600,000 tablets of HIV-AIDS drugs to Rwanda in 2008 and 2009, after the country made a request for the drugs, is proof that it does work. It may not work to the efficiency and effectiveness of many we have heard from, but in its present form it does work. If it is compared with the access to medicines regimes in other countries, Canada is the only country around the world that has actually been able to use the system to deliver drugs to a third world country, a country in need.

In my view, along with what my colleague from the Bloc has said, that tells me that the regimes as set up now are not working to people's satisfaction. However, that does not mean that the regime we have is not set up in a proper, legal, and effective form. Maybe we should be looking at a broader review of what we can do to make sure we provide HIV drugs to those countries in need.

At the conclusion of the committee's review, members voted to substantially amend Bill C-393. One of the changes the committee considered necessary was the removal of the clauses that would allow Canada's access to medicines regime to be used by generic companies to export any amount of any drug to almost any country, including some that are relatively well off. This is sometimes known as the one-licence solution.

• (1130)

It is my understanding that the committee considered the elimination of the one-licence solution and the other changes to Bill C-393 necessary to ensure that the bill respects Canada's international trade obligations and maintains the integrity of

Canada's framework for encouraging innovation and to ensure access to medicines for Canadians.

My key concern with the motions before us today is that they seek to undo all of the good work of the committee and they undermine the conclusions our fellow members of Parliament reached after careful review of Bill C-393.

In addition, I have particular concerns with Motion No. 3. The motion is original, in that it proposes to implement changes to Canada's access to medicines regime on a trial basis; first, for an initial period of four years, and then for a further five years, if both Houses agree.

As I have said, during the committee's review of Bill C-393, several witnesses noted that Canada's access to medicines regime works to send drugs to developing countries in need. It is the only regime, as I have said, of its kind in the world to have had this kind of success. As a result, it is our view that Canada's access to medicines regime does not need the changes that Bill C-393 proposes on a temporary basis.

I am also concerned that allowing provisions of Bill C-393 to have a temporary effect would be harmful because it would do nothing to improve primary health in developing countries. In our government's opinion, the best way to improve primary health care is through programs such as the Muskoka initiative that actively work to improve poor health conditions in African countries.

For all of these reasons, I am of the view that none of the motions to amend Bill C-393 should be accepted today by members of Parliament and that at third reading this bill should be defeated. Canada's access to medicines regime works and does not require changing.

In reviewing Canada's initiatives on access to medicines, the needs of developing countries must be balanced with the needs of Canadians. In sending over 15 million tablets of HIV-AIDS drugs to Rwanda, the current access to medicines regime has demonstrated that it achieves this balance; and the regime would not be improved by Bill C-393 or the motions put forward today. Therefore, I ask my colleagues not to support the report stage motions to amend Bill C-393.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Elizabeth Rennie and her team of grandmothers. Grandmothers to Grandmothers has come to see me many times. I have been very clear to this organization that I think the bill needs changes and that it would not have any effect on our being able to provide the drugs the organization would seek for African countries. This was passed by all parties. I think all parties should look at what we can do to continue to provide support for those countries, but I do not think it is through changes to this regime.

• (1135)

Ms. Joyce Murray (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be back in the House today and would like to welcome all members back to this first day of the 2011 session.

Private Members' Business

I am also very pleased to debate this topic again. I spoke to it last in November 2009. Since then there has been considerable work done on Bill C-393, a bill that proposes to amend Canada's access to medicines regime. However, I would like to touch again on the reason this matters.

I was born in South Africa and spent much of my childhood there. I went back in 2002, and visited Soweto and people there knowing full well that 50 per cent of the people in Soweto at that time were infected with the HIV-AIDS virus. That meant that of every child born to an infected mother, one out of two was infected with the AIDS virus, and of every baby born who was infected with the virus, one out of two, or half, would not live past their second birthday. This is also a humanitarian tragedy in Africa.

I visited with a cousin who was a manager in an important industry in South Africa. I asked how the economy was doing, and he said that one of the key challenges was that with the prevalence of AIDS in South Africa, people were being trained to be managers, technicians, professionals, and workers but then leaving and dying early because of the AIDS scourge. Therefore, it is also an economic tragedy in South Africa.

In Africa approximately five million people have access to AIDS treatments comparable to what we have in Canada, but 10 million people in Africa do not. That is why the bill for CAMR was put forward in 2004 by a Liberal government to provide access to such medicines and to enable Canadian companies to export low-cost, generic drug cocktails to help lessen those tragedies.

Although the hope was that there would be a flow of royalties to Canadian companies and a flow of life-giving medication to Africans who required it, that bill just did not work. The legislation was flawed with bureaucratic and institutional barriers that made it unworkable. Essentially, only one contract was signed and implemented under that law. Therefore, Bill C-393 was put forward as a solution to address those problems and make it easier accomplish the objectives of CAMR.

There are members in the House who believe that Bill C-393 is imperfect and does not do enough to address systemic problems in providing access to affordable AIDS medication in Africa. I understand that reasonable people can sometimes disagree on the means to a common end: supporting Canadian businesses and those people in Africa who need medication for AIDS.

To those MPs, I would say that the motion for the one-licence solution that is at the core of the bill must reinstate the latter for Bill C-393 to become meaningful, and that it will help. There have been many credible witnesses before the committee who said that Bill C-393, while perhaps not being the full solution to AIDS in Africa, would improve access to affordable AIDS medication for people who are dying without it, as well as protecting the interests of the patent owners of those medications. Let us help the Africans and support Bill C-393 and its one-licence solution.

I would like to make a few comments beyond the direct implications of the bill.

Imagine if the 10 million people in Africa currently carrying the HIV-AIDS virus and suffering and dying from AIDS were receiving the drug cocktails that turn this dreadful killer of a disease into a

chronic yet manageable one, as we are doing in Canada. Imagine the well-being that would result in Africa and the economic and human implications of doing so.

• (1140)

Another piece that is starting to become clearer is drug cocktails. These medications prevent the transmission of AIDS. This is a very important point and an important underpinning for passing Bill C-393 with the one licence solution intact.

Drug cocktails lower the viral load of an AIDS patient to undetectable levels, which means they do not allow the disease to be transmitted. These cocktails are proving to be an almost 100% prevention mechanism. Treatment equals prevention. With access to these medicines people will no longer suffer the way they do without treatment and transmission of the disease will be prevented. If people who have contracted HIV-AIDS are fully treated, millions of others will be prevented from contracting AIDS each year. It is even more urgent that Canada support making affordable drugs available in Africa.

Unfortunately, the Conservative government is ignoring this prevention aspect of HIV-AIDS treatment. It has provided absolutely no support for pilot projects in Canada. There is a provincially funded pilot project in my province of British Columbia which seeks out AIDS sufferers who are not aware they have contracted the virus, or are incapable of managing their own treatment, so that they can be treated and the transmission of AIDS in Canada can be reduced. Six thousand people a year contract AIDS in Canada unnecessarily. With proper treatment, AIDS would no longer be transferable.

I would urge Conservative MPs to recognize the importance of AIDS medications as being not only treatment but prevention too. I would urge my colleagues to support prevention funding and projects here in Canada and abroad, which is what we are talking about with Bill C-393.

One member referred to Dr. James Orbinski, head of Doctors Without Borders. He has led this organization through some of the worst and most wrenching conflicts in Africa: Somalia, Rwanda and Darfur. Dr. Orbinski received a Nobel Prize on behalf of Doctors Without Borders. He has a great deal of credibility both as a medical professional and as someone who has worked in Africa on this issue. Dr. Orbinski commented that the possible failure of Bill C-393 with its one licence solution reinstated would be as unconscionable as leaving a room full of AIDS patients to die simply because they are poor and African.

Members on all sides of the House have big hearts. We want to see improvements in AIDS treatment in Africa and affordable medicines as part of that. I would urge all members to think about the foundational reasons of the importance that this bill go forward and soon. Lives are at risk every day that we wait.

Private Members' Business

We cannot let our brothers and sisters in Africa down. We must fix CAMR so these treatments can be provided affordably and soon. Humanity depends on it. I urge all members of Parliament to support Bill C-393 with its one licence solution.

● (1145)

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Halifax for her great work on the bill. I also want to thank the members who spoke in favour of the bill. The bill is very important. Since 2003 I have been trying to get the law amended or fixed properly. It was Bill C-56 originally.

I want to impress on members that we can make a difference. We can choose to make it happen. We have proposed under Bill C-393 WTO and TRIPS agreement compliance. By that I mean that it abides by all international laws. There can be no other excuse used during this debate. If members do not believe me, they can believe the Library of Parliament's independent research which shows that what we are proposing here today is legal internationally. If we want to make a difference, we can do it now.

Back in 2004 I spoke in this chamber about the law that we passed and my fear that it was built to fail. It has failed. There has been one application. Apotex got one drug into Africa, despite the obstacles of the bill.

We told the world something. We told the world that we would help, that Canada would stand front and centre, show respect and help people. We said that we would make sure that women, men and children would get drugs that we have on our shelves and in our plants, that they could not get because of the cost. We told that to the world. We promised the world that we would lead the way. However, the way that we did it is despicable. We made a law that does not work, which others replicated, which gave an excuse. Right now people are suffering. People are dying. That does not have to happen. Not only have we chosen to turn our backs on them, but we have given them a phony law and literally slapped them in the face. Canada, the country to which I belong, has done that.

That is a shame. I have seen that over the years as a member of Parliament. I have tried to fix it four times. I feel strongly about it. I thought about that on the way to Ottawa. I used to belong to the AIDS Committee of Windsor. Before that, I had friends in Toronto who were gay, who had AIDS, who suffered. I have seen friends die, and they had medication. It is horrible to witness the disintegration of a human being, and that is in the best of circumstances.

We have an opportunity to make a difference. We continue to hear that it is a great idea and the laurels of the bill are applauded but that it cannot work. It does work, and we need to try. We need to move the bill to the next stage. It has to go to the Senate. Let those excuses resurface there and let us find solutions. As New Democrats, that is what we have done along the way.

I have a brief time to speak today, and I have two amendments that I will propose.

We have agreed to compromise continually in this process, not only with the Conservatives, but with the Liberals and now with the Bloc. There has been an attempt, one way or another, to either gut the bill or pretend that we are doing something and then say that we are doing all these other things. That is not the point. The point is

this is one tool that could end the suffering of millions of people. This is one tool in the kit that Canada could use to help people.

Even if members' worst fears occur, we could bring the bill back to this chamber and fix it again. We could bring it back right away. We do not want intellectual property stolen. It will not happen with this bill, but that is one of the excuses that has been given. We have actually included the components of criticism that members have put. Even though we did not think they were warranted, we have agreed to them. Even under the worst scenario, we could bring the bill back to the chamber and fix it right away. New Democrats are prepared to participate every single day to do that. We are here today to do that.

I want to thank some people. I want to thank Richard Elliot and the grandmothers across this country, people who care for people and understand the connection, the values and principles with which this country could lead the world.

● (1150)

We have told them that we have a phony law that does not give them the drugs they deserve, that they could get to actually have good health and take care of other types of problems, as opposed to a solution.

There is no other excuse. The bill is WTO and TRIPS compliant. I have heard that. Witness after witness came to the committee. The same excuses were brought forward against this bill. They were not verified. At the very least, we could try with this bill. The people who are opposed to this are worried that affordable medicines will get to people rather quickly, and even more important, will get to the types of diseases that we need to get to. If that becomes a problem because it is happening too often and too fast, then we could revisit that. The excuses we have heard make no sense whatsoever.

The drug industry has blatantly said that if we do this it is going to cost us research and development and the industry will not invest in Canada. Despite the generous corporate tax cuts, despite all the grants and subsidies the industry is getting for research development and all the other incentives that have been thrown in the mix, the industry would throw the country under the bus just because a bill could pass that would, ironically, give the industry money. The pharmaceutical companies would get money for the drugs. They would get a percentage.

Again, I want to thank every member for participating in this debate. I hope that everybody thinks about this as the bill, hopefully, goes forward.

I would like to amend Motions No. 1 and 2. Mr. Speaker, I move:

Private Members' Business

That the motion proposing to restore Clause 2 of Bill C-393 be amended by replacing the definition of "pharmaceutical product" with the following:

"pharmaceutical product" means any patented product listed in Schedule 1 in, if applicable, the dosage form, the strength and the route of administration specified in that Schedule in relation to the product and any other patented product, or product manufactured through a patented process, of the pharmaceutical sector needed to address public health problems, especially those resulting from HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and other epidemics, and includes active ingredients necessary for its manufacture and diagnostic kits needed for its use.

The second amendment is long, and it is also WTO and TRIPS compliant. Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the Motion proposing to restore Clause 4 of Bill C-393 be amended by replacing the text after "4.(1) Subsection 21.04(1) of the Act is replaced by the following:" with the following:

21.04 (1) Subject to subsection (3), the Commissioner shall, on the application of any person and on the payment of the prescribed fee, authorize the person to make, construct and use a patented invention solely for purposes directly related to the manufacture of the pharmaceutical product named in the application and to sell it for export to any country listed in Schedule 2.

(2) Paragraph 21.04(2)(c) of the Act is repealed.

(3) Paragraph 21.04(2)(e) and (f) of the Act are repealed.

(4) Subparagraph 21.04(3)(c)(i) and (ii) of the Act are replaced by the following:

(i) sought from the patentee or, if there is more than one, from each of the patentees, by certified or registered mail, a licence to manufacture and sell the pharmaceutical product for export to one or more of the countries listed in Schedule 2 on reasonable terms and conditions and that such efforts have not been successful; and

(ii) provided the patentee, or each of the patentees, as the case may be, by certified or registered mail, in the written request for a licence, with the information that is in all material respects identical to the information referred to in subsection (2).

(5) Paragraph 21.04(3)(d) of the Act is repealed.

(6) Section 21.04 is amended by the following after subsection (3):

(4) The solemn or statutory declaration referred to in paragraph 3(c) is not required in the case of an application to the Commissioner for an authorization to supply the product named in the application to an eligible importing country for purposes of addressing a national emergency or other circumstances of extreme urgency in that country or for purposes of public non-commercial use, but in such cases, the Commissioner shall notify the patentee or patentees of the issuance of the compulsory licence as soon as reasonably practicable after it has been issued.

That is all about compromise by the New Democrats for those who are opposed to the bill.

•(1155)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): It would appear that the amendments moved by the hon. member for Windsor West are in order.

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar.

Mrs. Kelly Block (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I echo the comments of my colleagues here this morning in welcoming everybody back. It is good to be here and to be participating in such an important debate.

I too have had many opportunities in the past number of months to meet with representatives from Grandmothers to Grandmothers in my riding and to appreciate the commitment and compassion that they come to me with in sharing their concerns for providing this kind of aid to folks in Africa. I am thankful for the opportunity to provide my views on Bill C-393, An Act to amend the Patent Act (drugs for international humanitarian purposes) and to make a

consequential amendment to another Act as well as on the motions to amend Bill C-393 that are being discussed today at report stage.

Given that Bill C-393 has been under discussion in Parliament since 2009, I will begin my comments with a short review of the bill's history as well as the goals of the Access to Medicines Regime, which the bill seeks to substantially revise.

Canada's Access to Medicines Regime was developed in 2005 with three key principles in mind. The first was to provide a mechanism for developing and least developed countries to access the drugs and medical devices they need to treat HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis and other public health epidemics. The second was to ensure that Canada's intellectual property regime for patents continues to respect international obligations. The third principle was to maintain the integrity of Canada's business environment and ensure that Canadians continue to have access to the latest pharmaceutical products and innovations.

In my view, years might have passed since the regime's development, but all three of these objectives are still relevant today and must be kept in mind when considering next steps on Bill C-393. I would urge my fellow members of Parliament to also keep in mind that Canada's Access to Medicines Regime is the only one of its kind worldwide to have successfully authorized an export of drugs to a country in need. Thanks to the regime, in 2008 and 2009 over 15 million tablets of an HIV/AIDS drug were successfully delivered to Rwanda. This demonstrates that Canada's Access to Medicines Regime works as it was intended to support public health objectives.

As we may recall, Bill C-393 recently underwent an extensive review by members of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology. During this review, the committee heard from a wide array of witnesses, including technical experts in the government, representatives of several non-governmental organizations focused on HIV/AIDS initiatives, members of the pharmaceutical industry and concerned citizens. This extensive testimony thoroughly informed the committee about the health challenges facing people living in the developing world, which go beyond the issue of drug patent protection.

It is my understanding that after this extensive testimony was carefully reviewed by members of the House of Commons standing committee, the committee decided to eliminate many of the proposed changes in Bill C-393. In particular, it voted to remove clauses from the bill that would have expanded the definition of an eligible product for export under Canada's Access to Medicines Regime to any drug, and that would have allowed the regime to export any amount of any drug to almost any country for an unlimited period of time. This is sometimes referred to as "the one-licence solution".

The trouble with this is that if the one-licence approach is applied to Canada's Access to Medicines Regime, it would allow drugs to be sent to high-income countries like Singapore, obviously counter to the original principles of the regime.

Government Orders

•(1200)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): Order. The time allowed for private members' business has expired. The order will be dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence. The hon. member from Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar will have five minutes when the House returns to this matter.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

SERIOUS TIME FOR THE MOST SERIOUS CRIME ACT

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC) moved that Bill S-6, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and another Act, be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak on a very important piece of legislation. That, of course, is Bill S-6, the serious time for the most serious crime act, sometimes referred to as the "faint hope clause bill". It will get rid of that particular section.

[*Translation*]

As all members of the House know full well, Bill S-6 proposes important amendments to the faint hope regime.

[*English*]

The bill was first introduced as Bill C-36 and was reintroduced in virtually identical form as Bill S-6 in June of 2010. After debate and study in the Senate, the bill was, appropriately enough, passed without amendment.

I am always happy to rise in the chamber to talk about justice legislation and to discuss the issues that affect Canadians and the people of my riding of Niagara Falls, but I am saddened by the fact that we are still debating this bill, a bill that could have been passed before Christmas if not for the agenda of the opposition parties.

Unfortunately, as my hon. colleague from Edmonton—St. Albert explained during the report stage debate, some Liberal members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights chose not to listen to the testimony of victims and victim advocates and decided to delay this important bill by introducing unnecessary amendments, including deleting the title.

I have said this before about the opposition: that at some point it should take time to understand the needs of victims of crime. Unfortunately, it uses opportunities—as it did on this bill to get rid of the faint hope clause—to delay this government's important legislation and our attempts to fight crime and stand up for victims and law-abiding Canadians. The unnecessary amendments introduced by the Liberal justice critic and cheered on by the NDP and the Bloc were clear examples of the political tactics used by the opposition to delay our justice legislation.

I want to be clear in reminding the House that we are not talking about controversial legislation today. The bill before us is a bill that will get rid of the faint hope provision that currently allows a murderer to apply to be eligible for early parole after serving only 15 years in custody. It is legislation that will correct a law that has left

many ordinary Canadians perplexed by the existence of a process that seems to allow murderers to get around the sentences imposed on them in open court after fair and public trials.

More importantly, it is legislation that victims have been asking for. I have met with victim after victim, and they have told me that the current faint hope regime must be repealed because it re-victimizes them and forces them to relive the horror that was the death of their loved ones. It is inconceivable to me that such an important matter as the protection of the families and loved ones of murder victims should be delayed because certain members do not like the title of the bill.

The measures proposed in Bill S-6 aim to accomplish three simple goals.

The first is to restore truth in sentencing by ensuring that the sentence pronounced on a convicted murderer in open court is the sentence that is served. It should not be too unreasonable for anybody that the sentence pronounced on a convicted murderer in open court is the sentence that should be served. That is reasonable.

The second is to keep those convicted of the most serious crimes in prison for lengthier periods of time, commensurate with the gravity of the crimes.

The third—and, in my opinion, the most important—is to ensure that the families and loved ones of murder victims are not themselves victimized at the whim of a convicted murderer who may decide to bring an application to be eligible for early parole. All this does is force families and loved ones to re-experience the pain of their original loss. They are victimized again and again. I do not think the goals of this bill are controversial or unreasonable and I believe the vast majority of Canadians agree.

As I have said many times before, this government is committed to redressing the balance in Canada's criminal justice system by considering the interests of law-abiding citizens. We are committed to ensuring that families and loved ones of victims are not themselves re-victimized by the justice system, and this is exactly what Bill S-6 accomplishes. This is a fair, balanced and reasonable reform of a controversial area of the law, and it should have the complete support today of all members of the House.

•(1205)

Mr. Brian Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Justice a couple of questions, because it seems to me that we have very faint hope of actually getting straight answers from the minister on simple questions like this: why was this bill delayed?

He talked about Bill C-36 in the previous Parliament. Where was it in December 2009? It was well on its way to going through committee, and his government, his Prime Minister, cut the legs out from under him by proroguing Parliament.

Government Orders

It started at the bottom of the pile as the current bill in April 2010. Four months take place; it is the government's fault. Prorogation occurs; it is the government's fault.

The bill makes its way through the Senate and makes its way to the House only in September 2010. Why the delay? Why is the Prime Minister cutting the feet out from underneath the minister?

Second, on this bill itself, I want him to tell me precisely how many of the 146 persons who were given parole earlier than they were eligible for under this section of the Criminal Code have reoffended in the history of this offence? Is it one? Is it 20? Is it 40? How many is it? He should know the answer.

● (1210)

Hon. Rob Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what we are dealing with. They never quite get it over there.

First of all, they spent the first couple of years with their colleagues over in the Senate holding up our justice legislation. Now that, thankfully, there is a government majority in the Senate, they figure they had better do the dirty work themselves.

He has questions for me; well, victims in this country have some questions for them. Why would they hold this bill up before Christmas? All this bill would do is reduce victimization in this country. What was their complaint? I had to tell people that they did not like the title of the bill. I had to tell victims who do not want to be re-victimized over and over again that the Liberal Party does not like the title of the bill.

He wants to know how many people have reoffended. I am going to tell members something. They still do not understand what this bill is about. This is about reducing victimization. This is not necessarily about those people who got out after 15 years. These are the people who stayed in there, but the families of those murdered victims had to worry about this starting at the 13th or 14th year, and if they got by the 15th, then the 17th, 19th, or 21st years.

It is the victims we stand up for in this Parliament. That is what they do not get.

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I was not going to ask a question. However, after the hyperbole coming from the minister, I could not resist.

The reality is that the victimization of the family members of people who have been murdered in this country is primarily at the feet of the Conservative Party and the ultra-right wing of that party. The Conservatives have gone around the country and have told family members of murder victims that they are going to have to appear repeatedly in order to see that this person does not get out. Their position is that if they do not want this person to get out at the 15-year mark, they have to appear repeatedly.

In fact, that is not what happens. We have had four cases of people applying more than once. There have been four cases, out of thousands, of people applying more than once. The jury that hears the application the first time has the right to deny any further applications, and they do that on a fairly regular basis.

The reality is that the minister and Conservative Party members have run around the country and said, "Look, we are going to fearmonger you to death. That is what we are going to do." We see

victims constantly coming forward and saying that, when in fact the reality is just the opposite.

I cannot help but ask the minister why they keep doing that. He knows the facts. Why do they keep putting that fear into the family members of murder victims in this country, when the reality is not that at all?

Hon. Rob Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, I really find that incredible. It is the exact opposite. Victims' groups have come to us, as they have to parliamentarians over the last 15 years, and they are the ones who say they are re-victimized again and again.

I give credit to those individuals who are prepared to stand by us when we introduce these pieces of legislation because they know we are responding to their concerns. I have had families who have been victimized by one of these murderers tell me that when that 15-year period rolls around, they are tortured over and over again. They are re-victimized.

The NDP would not get that. I understand that. Its members would not understand that at all, but they are the ones who tell us that the victims are worried about whether this individual is going to get out or not. Many times, if not most times, they do not get out, but that is not the point; they are victimized again and again. That is what it is all about.

Another bill we want to get passed would deal with consecutive parole ineligibility. I know what the NDP members will be saying. They will be saying that the poor fellow is not going to be eligible for parole for 50 years under our bill. I say, "Good enough for him. If you're committing more than one murder or something, that is what you should be looking at in this country." However, the NDP will not be able to figure that one out either.

● (1215)

Mr. Joe Comartin: Mr. Speaker, my question is specifically with respect to the victims in the process.

As a result of the government proroguing and the delays it has caused with respect to this bill, we have gone through it twice. The first time Conservative members on committee called for grandparents in one case and a parent in another case, family members of a person who had been murdered. They did not do it the second time because on the first occasion one of the two witnesses called by the Conservative Party was honest enough to say that after a recent experience with dealing with somebody who had been released on early parole under the faint hope clause was convinced there are times when the clause is useful. Interestingly, that person was not called when the hearings were going on a second time.

Could the minister tell me why that person was not called? Did the minister speak to that victim when he heard that evidence on the first occasion? Did he change his mind and realize that the faint hope clause is a useful tool on occasion?

Government Orders

Hon. Rob Nicholson: Mr. Speaker, the NDP is sticking up for the faint hope clause. That is good coming from an NDP member. I am glad that party has come forward. For a couple of years those members were content to let some of their colleagues do the dirty work, get the bill out of the House of Commons and to committee where it would be amended or held up forever. Now at least those members have come out on the record.

I appreciate that the hon. member and his party think that the faint hope clause is a wonderful thing. I appreciate that he and his party are not going to support us on any measures that stand up for victims and law-abiding Canadians. That is their approach and their ideology and they are welcome to that.

I have talked to victims right across this country. They applaud the government's efforts to take their interests seriously, to make them paramount. That is what I said when I introduced this bill on getting rid of the faint hope clause. I am sure the hon. member would be pleased to sit down with some of the people I have spoken to, people who want to know if getting rid of the faint hope clause would stop people from committing first degree murder. It would be a challenge for someone to figure out why anybody would commit first degree murder and think that was a good idea.

I know for sure that getting rid of the faint hope clause will reduce victimization in this country. Not one more family will have to go through that torture and relive the pain inflicted on them after 15 years. But we are going further. We have legislation before Parliament right now that will have consecutive parole ineligibility. That possibility will keep the hon. member up at night I am sure. There should not be any discounts for people who commit more than one murder in this country. If someone commits two, three or four murders, that individual should have parole ineligibility consecutive to that.

Individuals have told me that their son or grandson was the second or third victim murdered by the same individual yet there are no consequences for that under Canadian law. We stand with them. We will do what we can to make sure that their child or grandchild counts for something in the Canadian judicial system. We owe that to those families.

Mr. Brian Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would not want the remarks of the minister to be stale in the chamber before I inform him and the House that in the history of judicial review under this clause involving over 1,500 eligible offenders, 181 reached the stage of court decisions, 146 were granted parole before their 25 year eligibility, and out of 146, two offended. I am afraid that the minister is not aware of that otherwise he would not go into the hyperbole that my friend speaks of.

The minister wants to put in the minds of Canadians an enormous problem that has to be dealt with urgently by legislation but he does not want to tell the public that when his government was elected in October 2008 it killed its own Bill C-36, which was similar to this bill almost in its entirety. The Conservatives killed their own bill in December 2009 of their own volition. That minister must have stood behind his Prime Minister and said that is fine even though a lot of people in his riding of Niagara Falls want the bill. I did not read about any dissent. I never read about any dissent on that side. It is

not like there is a lot of independent dissenting thinking going on over there.

So the Conservatives killed their own bill in December 2009 and then after prorogation took 48 days to introduce this bill, essentially the same bill. It is not like those members are in a hurry with respect to the faint hope clause. It is not like the minister can go to his constituents in Niagara Falls and claim he is blameless, that he thought Mr. Harper should not have prorogued Parliament, that he thought this bill should—

● (1220)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): The hon. member is an experienced parliamentarian. Please do not refer to colleagues by their given names.

Mr. Brian Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that. Because of the recess, we have become a little relaxed on things. I apologize very much for that.

The Prime Minister of Canada killed his own bill. The Prime Minister of Canada took the legs out from underneath the Minister of Justice. However, he survived another day and then waited 48 more days to introduce this bill that is so important.

I will go back to the bill. On its merits, the bill is tough on crime. It sure is. It is late on crime, very late. There is a saying that justice delayed is justice denied. If the minister believes so vehemently in this bill, why did he delay it so much and do injustice to the people of Canada? That is a good question.

Some of my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the House, have tried to describe us on this side as weak on crime. Nothing could be more false. I wish our laws were tougher on a wide range of crimes. I wish the government and the minister would act with more dispatch on the important aspects that threaten Canadians today. Not two crimes out of 1,500 since 1987. There are far more important and urgent issues that involve the security of our public than this issue. Even when the Conservatives profess to think it is an important issue, they delay the heck out of it.

I consider the sentencing principles of denouncing unlawful conduct, deterring offences, and the separation of offenders from society to be very important. They are in the code that we believe in, the Criminal Code section 718. Every law should be seen through the prism of section 718 because it affects the balance of how we treat offenders. It is the Criminal Code. It is to put criminals in programs, including incarceration, that deal with their crimes. First of all there has to be an offender, there has to be a crime, and there has to be a punishment. We are talking about the punishment phase here.

Government Orders

The case that Liberal colleagues want to keep Canadians safe cannot be disputed. We want this country to be tougher on crimes and we believe we have very good ideas on how to get tougher. This does not mean we have to buy into the ridiculous idea that Bill S-6 is going to make Canada tough on crime. Let me be clear. The Liberals are not opposed to the repeal of the faint hope clause in this instance. The questions are why it took so long, why they are targeting something that is so minor in impact, and why they are dilly-dallying on the important criminal laws that need to be enacted.

Repealing the faint hope clause will likely have no drastic effect whatsoever. It affects such a small group of individuals that what negative impact it could have will likely be very limited. So we will not oppose it. However, we have to object to the shameless promotion of the so-called toughness of the bill and the whole Conservative agenda on fighting crime. It goes right to the top, not to the Prime Minister in this case, but to the short title.

The Minister of Justice went on about how inane it is to attack a short title. It is what Canadians believe the bill to be when they look at the short title. Someone looking at the short title of this bill, which was clearly crafted by some republican hack who also writes the tops of cereal boxes, would not have any clue what phase in the criminal justice system this deals with, and could not be guided by the short title.

This bill deals with the faint hope clause. It is to live or die, to eliminate it, to modify it, to let it live another day. That is what the bill is about. People may understand that, but they certainly would not understand the shameless self-promoting title chosen by the Conservatives, which engenders that they want a snappy title, they want to over-promise and under-deliver. Finally, it is their job every night to put the fear of potential harm that does not exist in the hearts and minds of Canadians.

Wow, what leadership that is, to say, "I am your leader and I am going to scare you tonight. Look at the 7 o'clock news". That is what the government does, and in this crime, the Minister of Justice is an accomplice of the Prime Minister of Canada.

I am ready to support a government, if we could see one that would be tough on crime. However, the only thing tough about these bills is the short title. Getting to that, the short title of the bill is "Serious Time for the Most Serious Crime Act".

• (1225)

If the Conservatives want to write poetry, if they want to write television titles, they should choose another occupation. However, if they want to stick to the realm of criminal law, they should look at the Criminal Code and pick titles that relate to it.

We Liberals have amended the bill to remove the short title. We amended the short title because it was disingenuous and misleading. Criminals who receive life sentences in Canada do serve serious time. How dare the Conservatives accuse us of delaying this bill for refusing to agree to a short title that tries to create a problem that does not exist.

Perhaps the problem is one of perception and the Progressive Conservatives, of which the Minister of Justice was a proud member and a cabinet member himself, can be part of the explanation as to why we have a perception problem with respect to life sentences for

first degree murder, for example. If we asked Canadians what happens when someone is convicted of first degree murder, the answer would be that one gets a life sentence. I bet if we asked if that meant serving life in prison, most Canadians would think so.

We have to remember it was a Liberal government that enacted this law as a compromise for eliminating the death penalty. This very intricate compromise has been upheld by the Supreme Court and commented upon. It seems to be the balance with which we have lived in Canada for a long time. It says that a person who commits first degree murder will receive a life sentence and will be eligible for parole after 25 years served.

In addition, this faint hope clause we speak of recognizes that if after 15 years in prison a first degree murderer has shown elements of rehabilitation, denounces his or her own unlawful conduct, is likely to be deterred for life and fits all of the sentencing principles that we have lived with in society, that person might be eligible for early parole after passing through a whole series of hoops, including the empanelling of a jury, the selection of a chief justice to review the file and finally a parole hearing. That is a lot of hoops to go through. As I have said, of 1,500 who were eligible, I think only 146 actually received the faint hope consideration or early parole.

Let us remember the years when a Conservative government was in power. It did nothing to change these provisions of the Criminal Code because Progressive Conservatives believed that this was an adequate balance. However, today the Alliance Reform Conservatives believe this is an urgent and pressing problem. It is so urgent that they introduced it, let it die by their own hand and took 48 days to reintroduce it. They are really ragging the puck on something that is so urgent.

What is urgent for the Conservatives is to get out before the media and say that there is a real problem with murderers running around the streets of our home towns and they are going to make sure they never get out of prison. It is disingenuous because, in this chamber at least, everybody knows that a life sentence means 25 years with eligibility for parole. Everyone knows that in Canada the average sentence served is about 28 years for a first degree murder. Everybody should know that is just behind the United States where first degree murder has a combination of the death penalty and 29-odd years.

Everyone should also know that there are developed, civilized, important countries of the world that have average time served for first degree murder at a much lower number of years: 10, 11, 12 and 13 years for countries like Britain, Belgium, Australia and the Antipodes.

Government Orders

We are not lax on crime. If I were to take credit for this legislation as a Liberal from the 1970s, one could not say that being just a hair under the United States for time served is lax on crime. It can be said on a newscast and said in here, but out in the public there ought to be a little more truth and sincerity when addressing important issues such as crime and justice. That has been lacking in the whole debate on crime since I came here in 2006.

• (1230)

At committee we have had expert witnesses tell us that not only is there no evidence to suggest that the elimination of the faint hope clause will make our communities safer, but Canada is a world leader, as I just mentioned, in incarceration times. It means then we are tough on crime already in this respect.

I have underscored before that hope is already faint. Correctional Service Canada shows that the average time spent is actually 28.4 years, 10 years longer than in many other countries. Hope is already faint for criminals here. Time in custody is already serious for criminals.

I had occasion, after we rose in December, to visit Dorchester Penitentiary and to see the conditions under which criminals were kept. I heard from wardens and officials at one of our oldest units in the country. They said that they lived a bit in fiscal and security fear of what the Conservative government had in mind by overpopulating a prison that was as old, almost, as Confederation itself.

Time in custody is already serious. If it is the government's will to make hope even fainter for criminals, we cannot say that two individuals is a track record of a failure in this regard. What we have to say is that this overall section affects so few criminals and people in our country that it is not really the object we want to talk about today. We want to talk about what the government has done in other serious areas of the law in law reform.

[*Translation*]

As I have already mentioned, this bill will have a very limited effect on very few criminals. The faint hope clause has been in effect for 30 years and has made it possible for 130 people to be paroled.

The Conservatives are trying to make us believe that the bill tackles a serious problem. Is that how they protect Canadians and show respect for victims? Criminals are not fools, and neither are victims. Bills such as this will not reduce the crime rate. What this bill really does is make a minor change to how a small number of inmates are paroled.

The Liberal Party will vote in favour of this bill as quickly as possible because it is waiting impatiently for this government to bring forward a bill that is truly tough on crime.

[*English*]

We want to move on with the bill so the government can have the time and space to put forward a bill that is truly tough on crime. At the justice committee five different witnesses have said the same thing, that the bill is not tough on crime. As John Howard Society told us in its committee submission:

Eliminating the faint hope clause, which in practice only allows the earlier application for parole of a handful of already assessed, low-risk, rehabilitated

applicants who have already served at minimum 15 years...is unnecessary...and will not improve community safety.

One would have thought in the ensuing years since Bill C-36 was introduced that there might have been new evidence. Alas, there was not.

The aspect of keeping people safe is far different than making them feel that they are safe. The government does a deep disservice to the latter by fearmongering and causing Canadians to feel that the system is not working. It is almost tantamount to treason to say that our criminal justice system does not work.

When first elected, Conservatives and the Prime Minister of Canada were not reluctant to say that Liberal-appointed judges were weak on crime. He also said, in his drive-by schmear, that the Liberal-appointed Senate was useless.

With the passage of time, Conservatives have now had their hands on the rudder for over five years and have appointed a lot of judges to the Supreme Court and the courts of appeal. I do not hear in the Prime Minister's speeches that it is now the fault of judges or that it is no longer the Senate's fault. Talk about victims. He is blaming a narrow number of victims for the perception that the battle on crime is not working because Conservatives have done precious little to actually attack crime. All they have done is make people feel that there is more crime.

This is the conundrum we have. If we speak against a law and order bill, we look like we are pro victim. If the government speaks against the judiciary, it looks like it is undermining the system. What it all means, unfortunately, is that Canadians cannot get a true picture of what is going on with respect to criminality in our country.

I would lay down the sword, along with the Minister of Justice and others, and say that some of us are lawyers and officers of the court. Law societies would be looking at me if I denied it, but that is extremely important. However, we have a higher duty than that. We have a duty to the Canadian public to be truthful and earnest and say, yes, that there are growing areas of crime that we need to attack surgically by implementations that we have spoken about at an all party committee in an in camera meeting. We have talked to judges in camera and know that these tools would be useful in fighting that criminality.

It is not helpful to go on the six o'clock news and say that it is a mess out there, that it is riotous, that judges and prosecutors do not care, that the opposition will not pass government bills, that people should head for the hills, lock their doors and turn out the lights or that they should get a shotgun because they do not have to register them anymore. The point is it is a disservice that all in Parliament is doing to the perception of public safety.

Government Orders

Let us talk about the Liberal agenda. Since prorogation, we have seen a series of bills on criminal law that simply fail to meet the expectation of being tough on crime. We have a different idea about being tough on crime. We want our country to be tough on crime we want to protect and respect victims. We will achieve that end with solutions that are based on evidence and on fact, not on being gluttons for glamour, TV, publicity and fearmongering that those on the other side are. The science of criminology has produced a multitude of sophisticated evidence based on research and fact and we are told how effectively tough on crime certain bills are.

In summary, it seems that the only part of justice the government gets is the word "just". We want to protect the victims in the funding of witness protection programs and counselling not by just funding the advertising of victims' abuse programs. We want to fund crime prevention so we can avoid crimes altogether not just try to scare people with harsher punishment that we know to be ineffective. We want to equip police officers not just throw even longer sentences at criminals.

I will conclude with a real-life situation. People should talk to corrections officers at a place like Dorchester and ask them if they are not a little afraid about public safety with the onslaught of prisoners who are coming in without the adequate resources and training within the institutions. What are those inmates going to do when they get out of overcrowded prisons with no treatment? That will be cause for fear some day and it has to be corrected.

● (1235)

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I must admit I am perplexed by the position of the Liberals. This law was brought in by them as a result of us, as a society, doing away with the death penalty.

At committee, the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine made it quite clear that her position was that although they would support the bill to get rid of the faint hope clause, when "they got back into government", they would bring it back. At a subsequent meeting of the committee, she backed off that position, making it clear that was her position and not necessarily that of the Liberal Party.

Is it the Liberals' position that at some point, should they or some other progressive government get back into power, they would support reinstating the faint hope clause?

● (1240)

Mr. Brian Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I like the comments of Justice Patrick Callaghan in the Vaillancourt case when he said:

—a very important "glimmer" of hope, "if some incentive is to be left when such a terrible penalty is imposed on the most serious of all criminals.

I will answer the question by saying that at the time of eliminating capital punishment and instituting the life sentence, it was felt this was a necessary provision. However, time has passed.

We have seen 1,500 people apply for this remedy and very few were eligible. It lends credence to the idea that a life sentence ought to be a life sentence. However, it will be a terrible outcome if after the 25 years of overcrowding and lack of programming that person gets back on the street and does harm to the community.

It really has nothing to do with this law. It has to do with the Minister of Public Safety's program to build the prisons to put the people in, but to provide no programs. It is a recipe truly for danger and increased crime when those people eventually get out after 25 years, if they are eligible.

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, prior to the member's speech, he asked a direct question of the Minister of Justice about how many people this would affect in the last quite number of years.

We all know the Minister of Justice. We have a lot of respect for him. We know him not to be an unintelligent man and certainly outside of this chamber is quite a pleasant individual. Yet he quite clearly was either unable or unwilling to put before this chamber the evidence to support his initiative.

The Conservatives have had five years in government. We have gone through two prorogations and quite a number of these bills, which have fancy headlines to them, yet the minister was unable or unwilling to put before the House the foundational evidence for the need for this legislation.

If it is true that we are functioning on kind of an evidence-free basis for the criminal law initiatives that the government wishes to take, if it is true it is unable or unwilling to put forward evidence, what is the basis for these various initiatives that have these headline-grabbing titles?

Mr. Brian Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that the minister did not answer the question.

Since 1981 there have been 181 court decisions, 146 persons were eligible for early parole and, in that time, 2 people violently offended.

The answers are one of policy and it goes back to 718. Members may think any one of the principles of sentencing is more important than the others. Clearly, the separation of the offender from the public, one of the principles, has been put at the top.

I would not dare answer a minister's question but I think the answer for them is that not everyone reads the law in the same way the government does. Not everyone thinks that all criminals should be equal and put in a pot for a judge to decide. Early on it has been against discretion in judges. It has backtracked now because it has appointed enough people to the bench and it cannot criticize its own.

The government does not believe in the pot of discretion for the balancing of those issues. It thinks the separation of the offender is the most important issue. If the Canadian people think that too, well that will perhaps be the issue for debate in the coming election.

What I want for my 8-year-old daughter and my 81-year-old mother is to have a safe community. I do not know anybody in this House who is against safety in the community.

Government Orders

I think the government is skewing the facts in its favour for one piece of philosophy which it thinks is primordial to the others, and that is separating the offender.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member who just spoke to explain how his party can be in favour of this bill when previous governments believed in the law and improved all aspects of it. It is giving extraordinary results. He said that there have been two cases of recidivism. We should add that neither case involved murder; one offender was convicted of robbery and the other of a serious offence. The law has been an all around success. Despite this fact and the improvements that have been made, in cases of death sentences commuted to life in prison, the average length of imprisonment has increased from seven years, before 1968, to 28.4 years today, or longer than in any other civilized nation.

I have the impression—and he will try to give another reason—that it is because they are afraid of the Conservatives' demagoguery on these issues. Am I mistaken?

• (1245)

[*English*]

Mr. Brian Murphy: Mr. Speaker, after 18 years of elected life, I do not think I will ever be afraid of demagoguery, if that is the word. So, no.

The issue is that there have been two offences and perhaps that is two too many. The issue is that the people in Canada, and not just the Conservatives who do not really care about the evidence, and despite the propaganda from the Conservatives, think that a life sentence is a sentence of life imprisonment. It is not. The sentence is really 25 years eligibility and the vast majority of those incarcerated get out at that time. A very small number stay in prison, otherwise the average would not be 28.4 years.

As I said earlier, perhaps it is an issue of how the people perceive it. When people are asked what life in prison means, all of this has to be explained. Maybe this debate will serve the purpose. However, 25 years for first degree murder is the sentence that Parliament settled on. If a person is convicted of first degree murder, the person more than likely will serve 25 years. I do not know how to explain that any better but there is the perception, which the member must feel even in Quebec, that people misunderstand this section.

We are the party of the middle, the party of compromise and we understand that people feel that the section is mis-described. We do not go all the way with the Conservatives in thinking that it is a huge problem. It has been a serious problem for two victims, which is perhaps two too many, but in the history of criminals and criminality in Canada, there is a lot more victimization going on right now in Canada that the government could more about. It could be more effective, more surgical, more co-operative with us, more surgical in giving more funding to police officers, and finally, like the ad about not cooking with cheese, the government could just stop proroguing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today we are examining a purely doctrinaire bill that seeks to strike down a piece of legislation and measures that have met all the

objectives set, that ensure public safety and that incorporate decisions made by juries representing a wide cross-section of the population. In addition, no studies have been conducted that show the failings of this legislation; we are acting on mere perception. I find it shocking that the members who spoke before me based their remarks on misperceptions. As legislators, what should we do in this type of case? I think that the voice of conscience must take precedence over public rumour.

Certain important things, such as liberty, justify me in listening to my conscience over public rumour, especially since the rumour in question is volatile and could change quickly, as evidenced by complaints about unanimous decisions rendered by juries.

What does this legislation do? It ensures that people who have been convicted of first or second degree murder cannot apply for parole.

First degree murder, which is currently defined as voluntary and planned homicide, is the most serious. First degree murder also includes murders committed in certain very serious circumstances, such as murder committed against a police officer or prison guard, murder committed as a terrorist act or murder involving sexual assault. The mandatory sentence for first degree murder is life in prison. However, those who have committed this type of murder can be eligible for parole after 25 years. It is important to note that these individuals are not freed after 25 years. In fact, most first degree murderers who apply are not granted parole; those who are can apply only after 25 years and so their application is reviewed only after a certain period of time has passed.

The minimum sentence for second degree murder is also life in prison; however, the judge who hears the case determines the parole ineligibility period, which can vary from 10 to 20 years. Nevertheless, those convicted of second degree murder cannot apply for parole until they have served 15 years in prison.

In 1976, the government thought that this legislation was necessary when it decided to abolish the death penalty. We still needed some kind of penalty that was a deterrent and life in prison certain was a deterrent. A parole system already existed, and it was decided that in the case of murder, the period before being eligible for parole needed to be much longer. That is why we have the periods that I mentioned.

In 1997, the legislation was amended to ensure that someone who committed multiple murders, or murders in some other circumstances, were not eligible for parole before 25 years. What was the purpose of that law? The Minister of Public Safety, who was known at that time as the Solicitor General, said it best.

• (1250)

He said:

A period of incarceration, with hope of parole, and with the built-in additional incentive for the inmate, and protection for the guards, of a review of that parole eligibility after 15 years is necessarily better than a sentence of death because it removes the possibility of an irreversible error of execution.

Government Orders

Thus, this was added to the Criminal Code in the hope that it would provide an incentive for long-term offenders to rehabilitate themselves and, therefore, afford more protection to prison guards.

It seems as though this goal was accomplished. There must always be some kind of hope when someone receives a sentence that could, in most cases, make them desperate and, since they have nothing to lose, cause them to do something worse.

But why 15 years? We realized that in countries such as England, Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Scotland, New Zealand, Switzerland and Sweden, that the average prison time was 15 years, and 12 years in Sweden.

And what were the results? One thing is certain: it cannot be said that this law was abused. In April 2009, when statistics were studied in order to review the law, it was found that although 991 offenders had been deemed eligible for judicial review—people sentenced to life in prison without any possibility of parole depending on whether they had committed first or second degree murder—court decisions had been rendered in only 174 of the cases. I have taken these numbers from a Library of Parliament study. Of these 174 offenders, 144 had been declared eligible to apply for parole. So 30 were not eligible to begin with. Then, only 131 were granted parole, representing just over 13% of those who had been deemed eligible to apply for a judicial review. Can we really deprive all those convicted of murder in Canada of all hope and not allow 13% of them to be completely rehabilitated?

We really need to understand that the murder cases we hear about are always the worst ones. But not all murderers fill us with the same horror as the case of Clifford Olson and the more recent case of Colonel Williams. In fact, we know that in 84% of murder cases, the murderer knew the victim. In my career in criminal law as well as prosecution and defence since 1966, I realized that murder is a peculiar crime in that it cannot be said that it is usually committed by people who would be considered criminals, meaning that they have led a criminal life or that they are regularly involved in criminal activities. They are not all street gang or organized crime members. Quite the opposite. People kill for all sorts of reasons: often it is out of vengeance, on impulse, for money, but quite often the murderer knows the victim, and some examples in Quebec last year prove that. The most serious example is that of the mafia godfather, Nicolo Rizzuto, who was evidently killed by a very competent hitman.

But there is also the case of the surgeon in Saint-Jérôme who had an outstanding reputation and who was loved by his patients and the community. But when his wife, also a doctor, left him, he could not accept it and turned on his two children, killing them.

● (1255)

There was also that terrible family tragedy in Lac-Saint-Jean, where the father and mother of a family were desperate and decided that life was not worth living, either for them or for their children. They bought enough drugs to kill the entire family. When the police entered the home, the entire family had taken the drugs. The police were able to revive the mother, but the father and two children were dead. The mother was convicted of this triple murder. It is also thought that some murders, for which the trials are not over yet, are honour killings.

Obviously there is a whole host of situations that lead people to kill. In many of these cases, it might not be so bad after 15 or 20 years to see whether we could trust certain individuals again, especially considering the financial and social costs involved. In my opinion, the social cost of incarceration is much greater than the financial cost, which in and of itself is not insignificant.

I am told that the average cost of incarcerating an offender in Canada is \$110,000. It is probably higher in maximum security penitentiaries. Only 2% of that money goes to the various programs for the rehabilitation and well-being of the inmates. Most of the money is required for satisfying security rules: walls, barbed wire, electronic systems, armed guards, three shifts and more for covering vacations, etc. All of this runs up considerable costs.

Let us be clear: when individuals are granted parole, they are not entirely free; they are under mandatory supervision. When people go to a halfway house, which is no different than prison except for the absence of bars and walls, they are still not free to move around. They have to eat and sleep as they are told, just like in prison. They are denied their freedom. They are far from being entirely free.

Of those who have benefited from this measure—only 13% of all those sentenced to life in prison for murder—that is, the 125 offenders who have been released on parole so far, 95 were actively supervised in the community and 15 were reincarcerated for breaching a condition of their parole.

So this is proof that they are closely supervised and that they must respect their conditions. However, of those 15 individuals, only two committed an offence. One committed an armed robbery and the other committed a drug-related offence. As we can see, public safety was not at risk.

● (1300)

In addition, the bill abolishes the system. Of course the system cannot be abolished for those who have already been sentenced by judges, who surely must have taken into account the fact that these people could eventually apply for parole. Furthermore, in cases of second-degree murder, the judges would have had to determine the length of the sentence before the accused could apply for parole.

Government Orders

So, there are still some people in the system. This means that if we were to pass this bill today and it were to receive royal assent, the legislation would not come into force for 15 years. In fact, it would apply only to those who commit crimes after it passes. Considering the time it would take for the bill to be passed and approved, it would probably take about 17 years for it to be fully enforced. It will eventually be enforced and this will complicate matters for the remaining offenders already in the system. First of all, inmates engaged in a rehabilitation process, who are under the care of psychiatrists and other staff, are sometimes told to wait a little longer because they need to be examined a little longer before they apply. This will no longer be possible, because the rules will be rigid and absolute. Inmates will have to apply after 15 years and will have only 90 days to do so.

After 15 years, the inmate has often been moved. Preparing his file takes several months. Some lawyers who deal with these cases testified before the committee in this regard. Furthermore, Correctional Service Canada acknowledged that preparing a file could take more than six months, but the application must be made within 90 days. The government has argued a great deal that offenders can apply for parole repeatedly, every two years. That is not true. Under the current law, offenders can go before a jury only if they obtain the permission of a judge, who must determine whether there is a reasonable prospect that the application will succeed. In the bill before us, it must be shown that there is a substantial likelihood that the application will succeed.

Then the jury must make a decision. If it refuses to grant parole, the jury may determine a period of time during which the offender is not entitled to make another application for parole. Thus, the idea that offenders can apply after 15, 17, 19 and 21 years is not true in practice. The government has been unable to give a single example where there have been such repeated requests.

I would like to point out that, on the weekend, we received a copy of a letter to the Prime Minister from the Church Council on Justice and Corrections. This organization points out that the government's plan to send more Canadians to prison for longer periods is not a good solution and that higher levels of incarceration in society in general do not have a deterrent effect. There must be a deterrent; however, prison as a deterrent must be used in moderation. I am quickly summarizing. I agree with them that this does not respect the fundamental principles of religion, such as caring for one's neighbour and its ramifications, and forgiveness. They believe that man is imperfect, a sinner, but that he can rehabilitate himself.

The bill is useless and not supported by any study, whereas the law the Conservatives want to amend has given good results. There is only one reason for what they are doing: they want to flog their ideology. I would remind my colleagues that everyone the minister said he met with could very well be called to be on a jury that hears these cases. I do not understand why, suddenly, the minister is afraid of their opinion and does not want more offenders to go before them.

• (1305)

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I always appreciate the input of the hon. member in debates on justice issues.

We have had this debate many times before. It has to do with a government that has not been governing but rather campaigning on slogans and one of its slogans is that it will be tough on crime. However, many of the bills have been recycled, delayed and reconstituted. Some may not be at the same position but may be part of an omnibus bill in some cases.

The justice committee has been backlogged with so many bills that probably many of them could have been consolidated. If the government were serious about an agenda to address crime, it would have put these matters forward in a fashion in which they would become law within a reasonable period of time.

Not only has the government not done that. It is building prisons because of rising levels of unreported crime by unreported criminals. The issue here is that the purpose of our justice system is to deal with not only the punishment of crime but the rehabilitation and the reintegration of people, because eventually they will be released and the safety of society depends on that happening successfully.

Perhaps the member might want to comment.

• (1310)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Ménard: Mr. Speaker, the member is right. I completely agree with him. The government's game of introducing bills, killing them with prorogation and then introducing them again makes complete sense in light of their philosophy. Its philosophy does not involve tackling crime. It does not aim to reduce the number of crimes committed. In fact, the Conservatives noticed that in the United States, being tough on crime pays off in terms of votes.

Therefore, when a bill is introduced and is given first reading, then second reading, then it is killed and introduced again, and so on, the government is pandering to a public that wants to be tough on crime. But being tough on crime can be completely stupid. What is important—and I love this expression from the Liberal Party—is being smart on crime.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Szabo: Mr. Speaker, to follow up on that point, it is important to be smart on crime as well. It is very important that the public interest is served but public interest is not served when the government puts forward a minister who parrots lines of an election and uses some hot button phrases and yet none of its members speak to the bill because they have been told not to. This is the fallacy of its commitment to be tough on crime. It is to be tough on electioneering and campaigning.

The House deserves to get answers. When the member for Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe asked two straightforward questions of the minister, the response was a litany of electioneering slogans. The bill was last reported back from committee before committee members had the benefit of a government study, survey and report, data which reported and demonstrated the weakness in the arguments made by the government on the legislation. The member may know about that.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: Mr. Speaker, I completely agree with the member who asked this question. This government's Minister of Justice has become the minister of propaganda. There are many examples. He is constantly saying that they support victims and that we support criminals. This is completely untrue. No one can say such a thing in good faith, knowing that they are telling a blatant lie. We have different opinions on the best way to deal with crime. The Conservatives follow the United States' tough on crime model. It was profitable for American representatives to campaign against crime, so much so that the incarceration rate in the United States is now seven times higher than in Canada.

Let us take the cost of correctional services and multiply it by seven to see how much such a campaign would cost us. Is the United States obtaining better results? Not at all. The homicide rate in the United States is three and a half times higher than in Canada and, might I add, five times higher than in Quebec.

Although this is clearly a very bad example to follow when dealing with crime, it is profitable because people always form their initial opinion based on emotion. However, once they consider the issue more carefully, they form a more rational opinion. The Conservatives are doing what they are doing because it is profitable for them.

[English]

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as I was listening to the minister in his opening speech this afternoon, I could not help but think of my many years in court and that if this issue were ever put before a court in this land, any court, whether a criminal court or a civil court, it would get dismissed on a preliminary motion for want of any factual basis. It would not make it past a preliminary motion because there is no evidence, none whatsoever, to justify doing away with the faint hope clause.

We have to look at this issue historically and where it came about, to look at the point where this legislature decided that it would do away with the death penalty. We recognized that we had to deal with the issue of sentencing with regard to murder, first degree and second degree and manslaughter, and we did that.

It is interesting to go back and read some of the evidence that was put before the justice committee at that time. It is clear that the committee knew at that time that across western democracies, the ones with societies similar to Canada's, people convicted of first or second degree murder were being incarcerated for between 10 and 15 years on average before they were eligible for parole. That was the situation back in the 1970s when we decided to do away with the death penalty.

There was great pressure at that time from various elements of society that that was not acceptable. Therefore, the compromise was that we would fix it at 25 years for first degree murder before eligibility for parole, but that we would allow for those exceptional cases to apply after 15 years. That is where the current 15 years in the Criminal Code comes from, allowing people who are convicted of first degree murder and, in some cases, second degree murder, and sentenced to 25 years, or more than 15 years, to be able to apply at 15 years.

In addition to the compromise that was reached at that time, we also fixed very rigid terms as to how a person could become eligible to apply for parole. It would not be automatic. A person would actually have to go through two steps, and that is still the situation today, but it will be done away with by this bill. First, the person has to convince a judge in the area where the murder was committed that he or she at least has a reasonable case for release. If the judge says yes, then the case goes on to a judge and jury, where the jury decides whether the person is going to be allowed to apply for parole. The parole board still has to deal with it.

Those hearings are always held in the same communities where the murders were committed. And at that time, we gave juries in those communities the right to have all the evidence of the facts around the murder and all the evidence with regard to how the convicted murderer had functioned in the prison system after being convicted and sentenced and incarcerated.

At that time, we gave juries the authority not only to grant the application for early parole but also the right to turn the application down, which they do on a regular basis. We also gave them the authority to tell the person that he or she cannot apply again for up to 25 years. Juries do that occasionally as well, Clifford Olson being one example.

Hence, what we are doing here with Bill S-6 is in effect saying to those juries that we do not trust them to do this right, even though they have in fact done an excellent job in dealing with these cases, and that we no longer trust the judges to do it either. We are going to fix the time here absolutely at 25 years: no one is going to be allowed to apply for parole, no matter how well the person may have in fact rehabilitated himself while in custody for that 15-year period.

• (1315)

When we look at this system, there is no other methodology that we have used in our corrections system that has been more successful than this one in terms of avoiding recidivism. This one has absolutely been the most successful. Of all the people who have been released, and they are not a large number, only two have committed violent crimes. In only one of those two cases were there actual physical injuries to the victim.

There have been other cases where parole has been revoked, which again I think clearly demonstrates that system works. We heard from the people who work in the system and actually know it that the vast majority of those cases in which there has been a revocation of the parole, it has usually been because of alcohol or drug abuse, or non-compliance in other ways with the conditions that were imposed upon them by the parole board, things like their required place of residence and oftentimes a requirement not to associate with certain other individuals. The person breaches those, usually repeatedly, so their parole is revoked. It has worked because other than those two cases, there have been no violent crimes.

Government Orders

Since this clause came into effect, there have been somewhere in the range of about 4,000 individuals, although the figures are not completely accurate, who could have applied under the faint hope clause. In fact, only 181 of those who applied were ever granted it in the first round. Of those, 35 were denied by the jury and, interestingly, another 35, even after the jury recommended they could proceed, were turned down by the parole board. We have had only a little over 100, about 115 or 116, who have actually got out under this. We have only had two cases where anybody applied more than once, although there is a suggestion there was a preliminary hearing for two other ones.

When we hear the justification for this by the government, it is all about protecting victims. However, when we look at the facts, we have to ask, where are the victims who are being victimized by this process?

The Conservative Party and conservative elements in this country, including a number of media personalities, have gone across the country, fearmongering that every first degree murderer and second degree murderer who has more than 15 years is going to apply for the faint hope clause, when the evidence is overwhelmingly to the opposite. That information is not given out. We have to ask, if we are really worried about the families of the victims being afraid of what might come, why would we not do something as simple as educating them and advising them that this is the way the system has worked for over 20 years. Why wouldn't they be told? Rather than stirring up the fear of what might happen, tell them in fact what does happen. The government and that political party have never done that—never.

Instead, we have the justice minister and the Minister of Public Safety leading the charge, and the Prime Minister assisting them in it, stirring the pot and raising the fear when the reality is just the opposite.

When we look at those facts, we have to ask, as my colleague from the Bloc just did, why the Conservatives do it. They do it because politically they have been able to make it work for themselves. By raising the fear level in this country among the families of murder victims they have been able to garner political support. That is reprehensible. If we are going to protect the victims, let us be serious about doing it. Let us not use them as photo ops, as the Conservatives repeatedly do.

● (1320)

I challenged the minister when he was here earlier this afternoon that this issue was before the committee the first time, before the Conservatives prorogued Parliament, and let it die. Conservatives on the committee brought forth two witnesses. Everyone was expecting them to get on the stand, under oath in some cases, and say, "We absolutely support the government in doing away with the faint hope clause". The Conservatives were shocked. The grandmother of one of the murder victims was very forceful about being opposed to the continued use of the faint hope clause.

The other gentleman, interestingly, about a month before he testified before the justice committee, had the opportunity to be on a panel. He was an advocate for victims' rights, and he had done a fair amount of work. His daughter had been killed, and he had spent a good deal of his time advocating for greater assistance to victims of

crime and the families of victims of crime. Because of the work he was doing, he was asked to sit on a panel to talk about these issues. Also on the panel was another individual who was a convicted murderer and had been released under the faint hope clause. In the course of the debate, the father of the victim came away convinced that there were occasions, because he saw this other individual who appeared to have been rehabilitated and was doing good work in the community, when the faint hope clause made sense. That is why we put it in in the first place, because there are occasions when people rehabilitate, even convicted murderers. Interesting enough, he thought about it after that panel discussion, and when he came before us, he was quite honest to tell us that story and to say why he, in effect, had changed his position.

I cannot help but think, and I say this from my professional experience as a lawyer for a long time and the number of clients I had who had suffered the loss of loved ones as a result of murder, that when people can step over the need that we all have as a human element in our makeup for vengeance and punishment and look at it as a whole, what happened to that gentleman is usually what happens to the families of victims.

Again, we all use Clifford Olson and Paul Bernardo as examples, or Mr. Pickton. There are those examples where we know we cannot do anything to retrieve that individual. They will stay in custody for the rest of their lives. There are others like that. They are not the only three.

We also know there are times with the treatment that people are given in the course of incarceration that some of them are eligible to be treated as having been rehabilitated and treated as being eligible to return to society as a whole. That reality was why we brought in the faint hope clause. That reality is why we still need the faint hope clause.

I have to say to my colleagues in the Liberal Party and I do not want to use too strong a term, I really am sorry and I feel sad that they are not prepared to stand up to that bullying that is coming from the government side. It was one of their governments that brought this in originally with the support of the NDP at the time, clearly. It has worked. Again, back to my opening comment, there is no reason to believe that in a courtroom we would have no ability to convince a judge that it would not continue to work.

● (1325)

We look at what the consequences would be and we heard it from the Liberal spokesperson earlier this afternoon. We are going to have more people who have been convicted of lesser crimes who will have less access to needed services for rehabilitation coming out of prison, not necessarily the convicted murderers, although even some of them, who do not get treatment until they are nearing the end of their sentence as we heard from the ombudsman for Corrections Services. Prisoners do not get services, particularly mental health services, until near the end of the time of their incarceration.

Government Orders

That will spill over into all of the other people we have incarcerated. There is no indication from the government that it is going to spend any money on anything other than bricks and mortar to build more prisons to incarcerate more people. It is not talking about any programming dollars coming into play. The scarce dollars that are there now, which are grossly inadequate, are going to remain at the same level and more people will need them. That is one of the consequences.

It is interesting to look at the government's punitive approach. Ideologically this is all about looking at punishing people, not rehabilitating people.

I understand the Liberals taking this position, but in this case it is not valid. I understand that constant need of our responsibility as elected officials at the federal level, being responsible for the Criminal Code and for dealing with crime in the country. We constantly have to balance the need for society as a whole to respect the system and to support it, to believe that it is a just one and the need to actually treat antisocial behaviour in the form of criminality.

It is a constant balancing. With some basic public education, it would be easy to convince the Canadian public that this is a system that works. It is a just system that recognizes the loss of their loved one that the families have suffered.

Another fact that we should be telling the public with regard to how the system works is that of those people who apply for this faint hope clause, the vast majority do not apply until around year 19. That is the mean average. It is not at year 15, when they first could. Again I would remind people that somewhere around 87%, which I think was the last figure, of people convicted of first degree murder, never apply. They serve out the 25 years and on average spend 28.4 years in custody. Around 87% never apply.

This fear that we hear from the Conservatives that at the 15-year mark, the 17-year mark, the 19-year mark, the 21-year mark, the 23-year mark the family of the victim, their loved one, will be faced with this application is absolutely false. The average person convicted of first degree murder applies at year 19.

The system takes so long going through those three steps: the judge alone, the judge and jury, and then the parole board, that it takes more than two years.

We saw some statistics on the last five years, up to 2009. In those five years, of the 13% who applied and again a number of those did not get very far in the process, who did get released, were incarcerated from 21 years to 23 years. In fact, in 2009, the person released actually served 25 years. They had applied and got out at the 25-year mark.

We have all of these facts with absolutely no evidence supporting the bill, but both the government and the official opposition are supporting the bill. It is a really sad day for justice in this country.

• (1330)

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member raised some interesting points that made me think of one other discussion point. It appears that the government has assumed that everyone who has committed a murder is a heinous animal that has to be thrown in prison and the key thrown away.

I spent five years on the board of Interim Place, which is the shelter for battered women in our community, and I have worked with it for many years since. There was a case where an abused mother of a couple of young children killed her husband. This person is not a risk to society. After a period of punishment, which is necessary in our system, but in the best interest of society, those two children need a mother or someone to care.

I wonder if the member would like to comment on whether or not the faint hope clause was ever intended to deal with those cases where clearly there was no risk to society and it was in the best interest of the rehabilitation of the person as well as the safety of society that the faint hope clause be retained.

• (1335)

Mr. Joe Comartin: Mr. Speaker, any jury in this country would be given the facts. The evidence would be put before them about the murder incident, how horrendous it was and all of the facts about the individual asking to be allowed to apply for early parole. There would be 12 men and women from the community where the incident took place. Would we say to them or to this legislature that they would not take into account whether this individual is a risk to their community because the chances are that is where he or she would most likely end up. Of course, it is absolutely certain that would be a major consideration. Have the individuals redeemed themselves? Are they rehabilitated? The crucial issue is if they would be a risk to the community.

As a juror, they and their family live in the community. Would they let someone back into their community if they thought that individual would pose a risk to the community? The answer is obviously no. They would not do that and they do not do that.

Mr. Alex Atamanenko (British Columbia Southern Interior, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I know the member has worked very hard on this file and I often see in our caucus meetings the thorough analysis that he and his staff provide on various crime bills that come before us. It is done with a measure of objectivity and knowledge because he has served in the legal system for many years.

It seems that we now have a policy under the government to put more people in prison and spend more money building prisons. However, at the same time, we read that there are fewer people eligible for rehabilitation under the current system. The crime rate is decreasing, yet, as the member mentioned in his speech, somehow there is a campaign to make us all afraid so that we can support measures such as this and build more prisons.

Government Orders

Does the member feel there is a trend within the government with all these bills to take away the power from the legal system and from the judges and juries to make decisions?

Mr. Joe Comartin: Mr. Speaker, there is no question that is what has been happening because the Conservative Party, as opposed to its predecessor the Progressive Conservative Party, has been taking its lines, ideologies and standard of conservatism from the Reagan-Bush people in the United States.

What has happened there is interesting. On January 7, Newt Gingrich, along with Pat Nolan, who I believe is a member of the House of Representatives in Texas, blogged this piece, which is two pages of hard copy. They went through an analysis of what the U.S. government was following. There are some really interesting points, but the bottom line is this. Newt Gingrich, a Republican in the House of Representatives, an arch conservative, stated that it did not work, that it had to change because Americans could not afford to do this. He and Mr. Nolan are very blunt about it. I remember being attacked by the government over making the same points.

The government points to a number of states in the U.S. and says that it is interesting to look at these states. Some of them greatly increased their prison population and the crime rate went down a bit. However, if we look at other states that did not increase their prison population nearly as much but spent money on prevention and enforcement, their crime rates went down even more.

That is the history in Canada. The Conservative government is on the verge of cutting funds for the prevention of youth going into street gangs. The funds will not be in the next budget. It has made that very clear and it will dump it on the provinces. However, when we have spent that money, we have been effective in cutting the crime rate. By incarcerating more people, we do not do that. We take them out of the system and bring them back into society as hardened criminals and they commit more severe crimes.

• (1340)

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member always provides a very thoughtful analysis of whatever bill is in front of the House. I have heard probably more facts out of the hon. member in his 20 minutes than I have heard in literally dozens of speeches from government members opposite, who seem to operate in a fact-free zone with everything being ideology.

I was thinking over the break about what it was the government would achieve by this, other than creating an atmosphere of fear. People in an atmosphere of fear stop thinking and therefore consent to doing things they might not actually otherwise do if they have analyzed the evidence. I thank the hon. member for standing up for a system of justice as opposed to a system of punishment.

The hon. member knows that inevitably the government will be pushing a prisons agenda and robbing from the criminal justice portfolio's police and program services. Inevitably what will happen is there will be more people incarcerated and punished and our system of justice will diminish as a consequence.

I would be interested in the hon. member's analysis with respect to the creation of the atmosphere of fear when the facts do not support the initiative.

Mr. Joe Comartin: Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the comments about the thrust being all about punishment and not about rehabilitation.

I want to go back to some of the points Mr. Gingrich made in his article to support that. He used the comparison between Florida and New York. Florida increased its incarceration rate by 16% and New York decreased its rate by 16% in the same period of time. The crime rate in the state of New York fell twice as fast as it did in Florida in the same period of time. The United States spent \$68 billion in 2010 on corrections. That was a 300% increase in 25 years, right at the time when Reagan came in as president.

That is what the Conservative government is starting to do. It is going to do exactly the same thing. It is absolutely arrogant on its part and not based on any facts. It is going to spend \$9 billion on prisons, bricks and mortar. It is going to incarcerate more people and under the faint hope clause, they are going to be incarcerated for longer periods of time. For what purpose? It is simply so the government can stir the fear in the electorate to try to get more votes. It is disgusting.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to address Bill S-6 this afternoon. It is an interesting bill, to say the very least. When we read it, it states, "serious time for the most serious crimes". There is no doubt in my mind that the Conservative Party, over the last number of years, has taken the position that it wants to be tough on crime. To try to reinforce that, the Conservatives have come up with creative sayings in their bills, which, when they give their speeches to their constituents, give the impression that they were getting tough on crime.

When we look at what Bill S-6 would do, it is an interesting thing. I think the Conservatives have a good sense in terms of what public expectations are, but they cannot help but look at the title. I believe the title is an attempt to communicate a very strong message that the Tories are actually tough on crime. The bill would do nothing to really address the issue of crime. There would not be any crimes prevented as a result of it.

At the end of the day, it allows the government to send a very interesting message to its constituents when its members go across the country and cite the title of the bill. What we really are talking about is the faint hope clause.

I understand it was former Prime Minister Jean Chrétien who made an amendment to the legislation. We acknowledged that there was a need to put some restrictions in place. We saw that because, in good part, we wanted to listen to what the citizens were saying. That is why it was amended a number of years ago to recognize the value of putting in restrictions that would not allow for the faint hope clause to be applied to anyone who wanted to apply for it. Under certain circumstances, individuals would not be able to apply for it.

At this point, the government has as amended it even further. At the end of the day, we support what the bill attempts to do. However, I have many reservations with regard to the way the government tries to deal with the issue of crime and safety and the use of legislation to try to reinforce that it is being tough on crime. This is an issue which I want to highlight.

Government Orders

Recently in Winnipeg North the government decided not to reinvest in a number of programs. Those programs dealt with some of the crimes happening in our constituencies. They allowed for former gang members to participate in programs that would, hopefully, get them back on the right track. This is when government really has the opportunity to impact the types of crimes being committed in our communities.

On the one hand, we are debating an important bill, Bill S-6. The bill tries to appeal to those who want to see the faint hope clause diminished. It is not to undermine the importance of addressing that issue, but rather to highlight the need to get into our communities and do something that would prevent some crimes from occurring. That is why I thought today would be a wonderful opportunity for me to provide some comment on this issue.

● (1345)

A story in the *Winnipeg Free Press* indicated that some programs could be lost in the community of north Winnipeg and beyond. These programs assist individuals in getting out of gangs and other types of criminal activities by supporting good, non-profit organizations that really have an impact. On the one hand, we are debating this bill. On the other hand, the government fails to recognize valuable programs that prevent some of these crimes from taking place.

I want to highlight the difference in terms of approach in dealing with the whole issue of crime.

I understand the legislation was in front of the House before it was prorogued. The government is now attempting to get it passed through the second time. I suspect it will be more successful this time in getting it passed. We will just have to wait and see.

I cannot help but note that during the 2006 federal election campaign the government initially talked about getting rid of the faint hope clause. It has taken a number of years for the government to get it to this stage. One could question as to why the government has taken the legislation on the course that it has in terms of not bringing it to the House in such a fashion as to get its agenda dealt with quicker or its sense of commitment to passage. The government cannot blame opposition parties in the sense that the bill was before the House prior to proroguing just over a year ago.

It is important for us to recognize that there is some value to the faint hope clause. In many situations, different organizations, different stakeholders supported the rationale that was used in the creation of the faint hope clause, noteworthy organizations such as the John Howard Society and the Elizabeth Fry Society.

As the province of Manitoba's justice critic, I had the opportunity to meet with representatives of those organizations. These two stakeholders have an interest, like no other, in trying to get those who have committed crimes reactivated into society in a more positive way. I recognize they do not see Bill S-6 as a positive bill. They understand and appreciate why it was brought into the House in the first place.

In many ways it is felt that by offering that branch of hope, if I can put it that way, it would affect the way people might behave or participate in a more positive way while incarcerated, believing that good behaviour and upgrading their skills and education in jail might

assist them in getting out of jail earlier so they can become a part of society outside the prison walls and be more productive.

● (1350)

Representatives from both of those organizations will no doubt be somewhat disappointed with the passage of this bill. However, at the end of the day, we recognize how the faint hope clause has impacted the victims and their families and we understand the public perception of the faint hope clause and the need for restrictions. Those restrictions have been talked about over the years in terms of the need to have additional restrictions. By having additional restrictions back then, we recognized the need for changing this legislation.

As we go forward, I suspect there will always be a need for modifications to improve the law so we can find the balance in terms of legislation that gives our prisoners the opportunity to better educate themselves and be more positive in that prison environment so that when they are released into society they will be better able to participate in a more positive and acceptable manner. We believe that is very important. If there are things we can do to enhance or improve that, I believe we should be moving in that direction.

A number of my constituents are guards with Correctional Service of Canada. I can recall one occasion when the faint hope clause came up for discussion with a correctional officer. I found that he was fairly supportive of its concept. He did not necessarily agree that prisoners should have the opportunity to have their sentence reduced but he supported the concept, which is something we need to talk more about. How can we improve our prison system to ensure a higher percentage of individuals who leave our prisons do not return to prison? When we talk to many correctional officers and administrators of our prisons, we often get into a discussion about the revolving door syndrome and what we can do to stop it.

Those are the types of things that we need to explore. The faint hope clause was one of those tools that provided encouragement, that tried to say to those people within the prison walls that, under certain situations, they will ultimately be better equipped and better able to conduct themselves in a better way.

However, I do have concerns about other things that the government is doing at the same time as we are debating this legislation. It is important for me to emphasize to the government, whenever I get the opportunity, what I believe was the number one concern in Winnipeg North during the last by-election and, I would argue, is still a concern today, and that is the issue of crime and safety. I was disappointed recently in the government's failure to provide the funds necessary to provide the programs that would allow individuals who are on the off side or may be affiliated with gangs and want to get out of gangs, or individuals who are having a difficult time in their communities and are being attracted to environments that are not good environments to be attracted to. There are three specific programs that need funding and the ear of the government and I would suggest that the government act on those programs.

•(1355)

At the end of the day, focusing on crime prevention, looking at these types of programs, along with dealing with legislation of this nature would be a good thing. I am not convinced that the government is as interested in dealing with the necessary programs as it is in terms of sending a message that it can be tough on crime.

Talk is cheap. I would suggest that the government has a responsibility that goes beyond just passing legislation that gives the impression that it wants to be tough on crime. It needs to start dealing with the programs that prevent crime from occurring in the streets.

•(1400)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): I must interrupt the hon. member from Winnipeg North. He will have four minutes remaining when the House returns to this matter.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

CONSTITUENTS OF DAUPHIN—SWAN RIVER— MARQUETTE

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my gratitude to the people of Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette who recently elected me as their member of Parliament.

From farmers and ranchers, to commercial fishermen and loggers, to tourism operators and trappers, and to a wide variety of service and public sector occupations, my constituents represent the best of rural Manitoba.

My constituents have a deep commitment to their way of life. Our way of life stresses self-reliance, hard work, ambition, respect for property rights and dedication to family and community, plus a deep commitment to the responsible use of the Earth's resources.

My constituency has a bright future as we combine an economy based on the continued wise use of our natural endowment with those emerging economic opportunities based on new communications technologies. We now have creative entrepreneurs conducting global businesses from dispersed rural communities.

I pledge to be a strong advocate for my constituents and those values that sustain our way of life.

* * *

GEORGE VARI

Mr. Mario Silva (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in his eulogy of his dear friend, George Vari, the right hon. Brian Mulroney said, "George Vari's conduct exemplified both vision and dreams".

George Vari was certainly a man of both vision and dreams. He truly was a legend. He was legendary for his business acumen, his compassion for fellow human beings, his philanthropy and his character.

Statements by Members

His life was interwoven with many of the great events of the 20th century, including World War II, the 1956 Hungarian uprising and the enormous innovations and changes that ensued in the post-war era.

His innovation and creativity was manifest in the Tour Montparnasse in Paris or closer to home at Expo 67, as well as in projects across the world.

George Vari's life was shared with his beautiful wife, Helen. Their love is an enduring example of devotion and commitment.

George Vari has left this world but not before leaving his incredible footprints across the sands of time, never to be filled again but also never to be forgotten.

* * *

[Translation]

INCENDIES FILM

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Bloc Québécois, I am very proud to point out that the Quebec film *Incendies*, directed by Denis Villeneuve, has been nominated for an Oscar in the best foreign language category.

Based on Wajdi Mouawad's play of the same name, *Incendies*, known as *Scorched* in English, is about the search for one's identity and one's roots, with elements of a Greek tragedy and against the backdrop of the Israeli-Lebanese conflict. Splendidly adapted by Denis Villeneuve, one cannot help but be touched and amazed by this magnificent film.

It is unfortunate, however, that the Conservative government seems to be incapable of showing the same enthusiasm and pride in today's recognition of two giants of Quebec culture.

The Bloc Québécois would like to wish everyone involved in the film *Incendies* the best of luck at the Academy Awards ceremony, to be held on February 27, 2011.

* * *

[English]

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mr. Wayne Marston (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Saturday, in Hamilton, over 10,000 workers took to the streets in support of the retirees and members of the United Steelworkers Local 1005 currently locked out by U.S. Steel.

Local 1005 is fighting to protect both current retirees and for quality pensions for future generations.

Clearly, U.S. Steel is determined to put an end to their defined benefit pension plan because this lockout occurred even after Local 1005 offered a stand pat agreement to the company.

Hamilton steelworkers played by the rules when they accepted less in hourly wage increases in order to have Stelco fund the defined benefit pension plan that U.S. Steel wants to abandon.

In my opinion, the race to the bottom has shifted into high gear.

Statements by Members

Numerous labour leaders, including the president of the CLC, spoke of their concern that the federal government appears to have turned its back on its recent commitment to improve CPP.

Clearly, with 63% of working Canadians having no pension and no savings, increasing the CPP is urgently needed to ensure dignity for all future retirees.

* * *

• (1405)

LYNN ROSS AND RICHARD HAYDEN

Mr. Scott Armstrong (Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Lynn Ross was a dedicated mother and an outstanding classroom teacher at Truro Junior High School. At age 44, she began the school year in perfect health but she was soon diagnosed with cancer and told that she had a short time to live.

After a valiant if short battle against this disease, she passed away, leaving her family, school, students and hundreds of former students shocked by the tragedy of her loss.

Richard Hayden was a giant in the educational and recreational communities in Nova Scotia and a dedicated husband, father and grandfather. He passed after a long and protracted battle against this disease.

Those two were tremendous people who dedicated their lives to the service of others. I was proud to call both of them my friends.

Although we often disagree in this House, I know that we are united on this issue. Cancer is a plague upon the peoples of our nation and in fact the world. It is a plague that at one time or another has struck close to home for each and every one of us.

For those who have suffered—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Mississauga—Brampton South.

* * *

[Translation]

WEARING OF THE KIRPAN

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Mississauga—Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have been wearing my kirpan in the House of Commons since I was elected in 2004. In 2006, the Supreme Court confirmed the right of Sikhs to wear the kirpan.

I have visited other parliaments, the Supreme Court of Canada and the United States Congress. I have always worn my kirpan and it has never been a problem. Our discussion must be reasonable and respectful and it must avoid the type of rhetoric that serves only to divide Canadians. In my work, I have always promoted respect and understanding. This is the Canada that I grew up in and the Canada that I want for my two daughters.

Let us be reasonable and fair. In short, let us be Canadian. Let us respect the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

[English]

JOAN ELIZABETH CROCKER

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Nepean—Carleton, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour the life of an accomplished woman I called my friend, Joan Elizabeth Crocker. It is with sadness that I share with the House the news that Joan passed away on December 24, 2010, at the age of 53.

Joan was a good friend and colleague to many. I first met Joan in 1999 through the Magna for Canada scholarship program, which was then run by our former colleague, Belinda Stronach.

It is through her hard work with that program and various volunteer efforts that Joan will be remembered, for her mentoring and championing of young people and their causes. Notably, following Hurricane Katrina, Joan organized a team of volunteers to help in the rebuilding efforts in New Orleans.

Joan Crocker had much more to give to others. Her enthusiasm and zest for life will be remembered in our hearts forever. We are all richer for having known her and we will miss her dearly.

* * *

[Translation]

ANDRÉE CHAMPAGNE

Mrs. Ève-Mary Thāi Thi Lac (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in response to an open letter I sent to Conservative Senator Andrée Champagne, asking her to explain her refusal to support Bill C-232 regarding bilingual judges and Bill C-311 on climate change, she replied with comments that bordered on racist.

She said that I lacked loyalty to Canada, “the country that welcomed me and that I wanted to see torn apart”. Is the Conservative Senator trying to say that a citizen who was not born here does not have the same right to an opinion as other Quebeckers and that he or she does not have the right to vote or be involved in a sovereignist party? She added that she was a “purebred Quebecker,” as evidenced by her genealogy.

The Bloc Québécois believes in openness and believes that all Quebeckers, regardless of where they come from, should have full rights of citizenship, including the right to decide Quebec's future.

* * *

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is concerned by the recent violence and unrest in Tunisia, Egypt, and Yemen. We regret the continued loss of life during these protests and reiterate the call by the Minister of Foreign Affairs for all parties to refrain from using violence and for authorities to respond to these protests peacefully.

Our government condemns any action that hampers democracy, freedom, and the rule of law. These core principles are at the centre of this government's foreign policy.

Our government will continue to impress upon the governments in the region the need to renew their commitment to strengthening the basis for democracy, consultation, dialogue and cooperation.

We urge the governments of Tunisia, Egypt, and Yemen to accelerate the pace of democratic and economic reforms in order to meet the aspirations of their citizens.

* * *

●(1410)

RYAN RUSSELL

Hon. Ken Dryden (York Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Ryan Russell was 35 years old. He had a wife and young son. He loved hockey; he was a goalie. He loved his job. It is what his father had done, and his father had been his hero. One day a few weeks ago, he left to go to work, more than 40 years of his life still ahead of him. In an instant, it was over.

In Toronto, more than 10,000 people attended his funeral. Beforehand, many had stood on sidewalks waiting for the procession, the city quieter than I had ever heard it before.

We try so hard to take the risk out of our lives. Then we see some people, police officers, firefighters, soldiers and others, who take on more risk and do it willingly to make us safer. How can they do it, we wonder. Could we?

So a city stopped, to feel sad, to offer hope for the survivors, and for Sergeant Russell and for all those who do what he did, to say thank you.

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Phil McColeman (Brant, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today the House resumes sitting and I can proudly say that on this side of the House, Conservative members are eager and ready to get to work for Canadians. This work includes moving on important crime bills that remain before the public safety committee. It is my hope that our eagerness is shared by opposition members across the way. Unfortunately, I am afraid that it already seems to be business as usual for some Liberals.

Today the member for Ajax—Pickering is again sticking up for criminals and promoting the failed prison farm system, a program with a dismal rate of success of less than 1%, and which loses millions of tax dollars each year. I call on the Liberal Party public safety critic and his coalition partners to work with us to get results for law-abiding Canadians and victims and to stop putting criminals' rights before those of victims.

* * *

YOUTH GANG PREVENTION FUND

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to implore the federal government in the strongest possible terms to renew and extend the funding for the youth gang prevention fund, scheduled to end this March. Spending billions of dollars on new prisons while eliminating funding for these successful crime prevention measures gives a whole new meaning to the term “penny wise and pound foolish”. It is a false economy that defies reason, logic, and common sense.

We know that we can steer at-risk youth away from the crime and the violence of street gang life if we intervene at an early stage. These programs provide mentorship, job and life skills, recreation

Statements by Members

and, most importantly, a clean, safe and healthy place to go, in contrast to the streets. Programs like Circle of Courage, Project O.A. S.I.S., Turning the Tides, the West Central Youth Outreach Project, and Just TV are small, effective programs that show proven results in helping at-risk youth stay out of destructive gang life.

For the cost of keeping just one inmate in prison for one year, any one of these programs could continue. I urge the government to listen to common sense and extend the funding for the youth gang prevention fund.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Jacques Gourde (Lotbinière—Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the economy is the government's top priority. Canada's steady economic growth proves that we are on the right tack.

Thanks to Canada's economic action plan, our country weathered the storm better than any other industrialized country and is leading the economic recovery. According to Statistics Canada, the Canadian economy has created 400,000 jobs since July 2009—the strongest job growth in the G7—and the economy has grown for five straight quarters.

These are positive signs, but the economic recovery remains fragile, as we have said all along. If we continue to implement our Prime Minister's tax relief plan to protect and create jobs, neither the leader of the Liberal Party nor his plans to increase taxes will be able to slow down our recovery, kill jobs and set Canadian families and workers back.

* * *

●(1415)

DEATH PENALTY

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has given us yet another reason to fear a Conservative majority, as though we needed another one. He has said, “there are times where capital punishment is appropriate”. In the same breath, he also said he did not wish to reopen the debate.

Need I remind the House that he said the same thing about abortion? Yet the Prime Minister did nothing to stop his backbenchers from introducing bills to reopen that debate, which was considered closed.

Even more worrisome, he did not hesitate to support those bills. We can only assume that he would do the same for the issue of the death penalty and that these kinds of bills would pass if the Conservatives were to form a majority government.

Instead of sending mixed messages and leaving room for ambiguity, the Prime Minister should accept the fact that the death penalty is a thing of the past and that it has no place in a democratic society.

Oral Questions

[English]

POLITICAL ADVERTISING

Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the lifespan of the Conservatives' latest round of over the top attack ads lasted about as long as their cockamamie plan to change the words of our national anthem. Does everyone remember that brain storm?

The only thing shorter lived was the support offered by the member for Edmonton Centre, who endorsed and tried to justify the ads one day but pulled an about-face the next day that would make Linda Blair in *The Exorcist* blush, saying they were not his style and to pay no attention to them. Well, Canadians were paying attention.

Did thousands of them call Conservatives to express their outrage? Yes, yes, yes. Did they expose the Conservatives for their dishonesty in these malicious attacks? Yes, yes, yes. Did some commentators compare the deceitful acts to the work of a bunch of drunken frat boys? Yes, yes, yes. Will Canadians reject this type of offensive Conservative smear and instead embrace a positive Liberal vision for this country? Yes, yes, yes.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mrs. Shelly Glover (Saint Boniface, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the economy is our government's top priority. Canada's continued economic growth demonstrates we are on the right track. With the help of our government's economic action plan, Canada has weathered the storm better than other industrialized countries and is leading the economic recovery. According to Statistics Canada estimates, the Canadian economy has created nearly 400,000 jobs since July 2009, the strongest job growth in the G7, and the economy has grown for five straight quarters. These are positive signs.

However, we have always stated that the economy's recovery is still fragile. Canada cannot afford the risk of the needless election that the Liberal leader is pushing for. We need to continue with the Prime Minister's low tax plan to protect and create jobs, not the Liberal leader's high tax agenda that would stall our recovery, kill jobs, and set hard-working families back.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Hon. Michael Ignatieff (Leader of the Opposition, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as events have unfolded in Egypt, Canadians want to be sure their government is speaking up for democratic values, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, an end to Internet censorship and a clear path toward a democratic transition.

My question is for the Prime Minister. What exactly has the government been saying to the authorities in Egypt? Are we or are we not standing up for democratic values?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I said, I think, in North Africa last week that the

fundamental basis of this government's foreign policy was the encouragement of freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law. Those are the values that we express to all governments around the world.

Obviously important events are unfolding in Egypt. We want to see it transition toward the basic values of freedom, democracy, human rights and justice. We want to ensure the transition does not tend toward violence, instability and extremism.

[Translation]

Hon. Michael Ignatieff (Leader of the Opposition, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians in Egypt are complaining about how slowly the Canadian government is reacting. They are calling the embassy and are getting an answering machine. They are going to the airport only to find that their flights have been cancelled or delayed. The Government of Canada's reaction has been chaotic. The Conservative government has been making cuts to Canadian diplomatic services for years.

Is the Prime Minister finally going to admit that these cuts are endangering Canadians in Egypt?

• (1420)

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the opposite is true. There are hundreds of thousands of Canadians in Egypt and the government, the embassy, is meeting their needs. There is already a plane on site in Egypt that is preparing for takeoff with Canadians and other foreign nationals on board.

Hon. Michael Ignatieff (Leader of the Opposition, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are now paying for these irresponsible cuts both here and abroad. There will be other cuts if the Conservatives grant tax breaks to the most profitable companies in Canada. This gift to big business will lead to cuts to health care, education, diplomatic services and assistance for veterans.

When will the Prime Minister listen to ordinary Canadian families and do away with corporate tax cuts?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government believes that the economy, job creation and economic growth are priorities for Canadians. That is why we believe that it is important to keep employers' taxes low. We do not intend to increase taxes, which could have a significant negative impact on the Canadian economy.

[English]

Hon. Michael Ignatieff (Leader of the Opposition, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is raising taxes for small and medium size enterprises and giving tax giveaways to already profitable corporations at a time when Canadian families want to be able to put their kids through post-secondary education and look after their moms and dads in their homes. They do not see their priorities reflected in the priorities of the government.

When will the government start listening to those families where the elastic is pulled tight and start doing something for them instead of corporations that do not need the help?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government's priority, as I said earlier, is the economy and, in particular, economic growth and the creation of jobs. We are not going to raise taxes on employers in the middle of a recovery.

Oral Questions

I met today with representatives of business, including the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, and they would put out that the proposal by the Leader of the Opposition would raise taxes on over 100,000 Canadian businesses, something this government has no intention of doing in this recession.

Hon. Michael Ignatieff (Leader of the Opposition, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is raising taxes on small and medium-sized enterprises that create jobs in the country. It is giving a tax giveaway to large already profitable corporations.

The government says it wants to create jobs, invest in health care and education and give middle-class families some help and a break. That is what we are saying.

When will the government put middle-class families first and stop giving help to corporations that do not need help in the first place?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government had lowered taxes for all Canadian businesses in the 2007 budget. The proposal on the table right now from the Leader of the Opposition would be to raise taxes, not just on a handful of corporations but on 100,000 Canadian businesses.

The business community does not support that. It is not in the interests of job creation and the Canadian economy. This government will not do anything that will hurt the Canadian economy.

* * *

[Translation]

SALES TAX HARMONIZATION

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Ontario, British Columbia and the Maritimes have been compensated for sales tax harmonization, but Quebec is still waiting. And yet, everything seems to have been resolved: Ottawa recently declared that it does not have a problem with Quebec collecting the sales tax, a contentious issue just a few months ago.

Since all these details have been worked out, that is, there will be no tax on the tax and a single tax will be collected by Quebec, can the Prime Minister tell us what is holding up this file and depriving Quebec of \$2.2 billion?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it has been clear for a long time that this government favours sales tax harmonization. That is why we have agreements with a number of provinces in this regard. To date, the Quebec government has chosen not to harmonize its sales tax but to retain a sales tax that is distinct from the federal tax. However, we are currently negotiating this matter in good faith and making progress.

• (1425)

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebec's Minister of Finance, Raymond Bachand, recently stated that compensating Quebec for harmonizing its sales tax requires the political will of Ottawa. What is the Prime Minister waiting for to put an end to this unfairness and use the next budget to provide fair compensation to Quebec?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this government favours sales tax harmonization. However, the final decision rests with the provincial governments, which have

a choice about joining us. To date, the Quebec government has chosen to retain a single sales tax, but we are currently negotiating this matter. We still hope to arrive at a solution that respects the agreements we have signed with the other provinces.

* * *

FINANCE

Mr. Daniel Paillé (Hochelaga, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in the last two budgets, Quebec's loss was Ontario's gain. The federal government owes Quebec more than \$5 billion according to Quebec's finance minister. This is beyond negligence by the federal government. It is contempt. In addition to the \$2.2 billion for the harmonized sales tax to match the compensation given to the other provinces, there is the \$1.5 billion for equalization and Hydro-Québec, \$800 million for post-secondary education and \$127 million in stabilization payments.

When are they going to pay their debts?

[English]

Hon. Ted Menzies (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Bloc finance critic is welcoming us back with a question that is rather redundant. It has been answered many times before.

Let me remind him that actually the transfers to Quebec have increased 44% under this government. That is the plain and simple answer. I am not sure what his question is all about other than just to remind Canadians how much we do support Quebec.

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Paillé (Hochelaga, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the junior finance minister should do his homework: these disputes have been going on for years. It is high time these matters were resolved.

The stabilization program issue has been dragging on since 1991-92. Even though two courts ruled in favour of Quebec, in 2007 and in 2008, we are still waiting for the federal government to pay Quebec its fair share. How can the government give billions of dollars to Ontario and nothing to Quebec?

It is Quebec's turn now. Does the minister understand that?

[English]

Hon. Ted Menzies (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, I can certainly understand that. I also understand there were no math lessons on the beach in Mexico, where the hon. member was getting his wonderful tan.

Let us go back to the facts. Quebec will receive \$7.6 billion in equalization this year alone. That is a 60% increase over when the Liberals were in power. Once again, I am not sure what he is complaining about.

*Oral Questions***THE ECONOMY**

Hon. Jack Layton (Toronto—Danforth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, since Parliament last met I have been travelling across Canada talking to Canadian families who are still struggling to get by in the context of the recession. While the Conservatives are declaring today, once again, mission accomplished on the economy, Canadians who are still trying to make ends meet know that is just hogwash.

Statistics Canada came out and showed very clearly that the full-time jobs that had been lost in the recession had not fully recovered and that the growth in employment, such as it is, was in low-paying part-time jobs. People cannot cover their bills that way.

Will the government commit to practical proposals by the New Democratic Party to help the middle class deal with the recession?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, since the recovery began, the Canadian economy has created nearly 400,000 jobs, which is frankly unmatched by virtually any other developed country.

This does not mean mission accomplished. There is still much to do to get the employment situation to the point where we want it. However, this government's conviction is clear that maintaining low tax rates for our employers is critical to continued job creation and to continuation of the recovery. Obviously we are not going to raise taxes on employers.

• (1430)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jack Layton (Toronto—Danforth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has a choice to make: help families or call an election. The NDP is prepared to work to help retirees and future retirees, for example. A number of them have seen their pensions shrink because of the recession. The government could help these people by increasing the guaranteed income supplement. That is simple and easy to do.

What does the Prime Minister choose, helping our seniors or helping the banks yet again?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government did help Canadian families, not only by cutting taxes, but also by expanding benefits such as the family allowance and by increasing employment insurance benefits during the crisis. Our government sees only one choice: helping families. And I encourage the leader of the NDP and the other opposition parties to not think about an election, but instead about helping families.

* * *

[*English*]

HEALTH

Hon. Jack Layton (Toronto—Danforth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister wanted to help out families, he would be doing something to deal with their health care concerns. We have emergency rooms that are overcrowded. We have prescription drug costs going through the roof. Home care is completely inadequate. Four million people do not even have a family doctor. One practical step that the Prime Minister could take would be to support the NDP

proposal to train more family doctors and nurses so no family has to go without that primary health care on which they count.

Why is the government refusing to help Canadian families with something such as health care, which is so basic to all of them?

Right Hon. Stephen Harper (Prime Minister, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government is refusing to do no such thing and always encourages positive suggestions on things like health care.

We operate in a federal system in which health care is the primary responsibility of the provinces. However, we have been working constructively with our provincial colleagues. In spite of the recession and in spite of the budgetary challenges of this government, we have increased the health care funding for our provinces by 30% and intend to ensure that funding increase continues into the future.

Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are worried about the rising health care costs in our aging population. They know that we must prepare to invest more in the health care that Canadians need.

With a record deficit, rising health care costs and on the eve of negotiations with the provinces on health transfers, why are the Conservatives going ahead with their reckless corporate tax cuts? Why are they putting our health care system at risk by gutting our capacity to invest in it?

Hon. Ted Menzies (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting question coming from the hon. member who I believe has actually run on promoting private health care. However, that is not the plan of this government.

Our plan is to get back to balanced budgets. However, part of that is reducing the costs for businesses in our country. Those are the job creators. Those are the people who drive this economy. By reducing their costs, they hire more people and it helps build our economy. It is that simple.

Hon. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government increased transfers and put \$41 billion of new money into health care. The Liberals cut corporate taxes in times of surplus when Canada could afford it, giving Canada the second lowest corporate tax rates in the G7.

However, now that the Conservatives have spent Canada into a record deficit, Canadians do not want the government to borrow more money to pay for more corporate tax cuts.

Why will the Minister of Finance not listen to Canadians and cancel his reckless scheme to cut corporate tax rates on borrowed money?

Oral Questions

Hon. Ted Menzies (Minister of State (Finance), CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always interesting to be able to read a quote back to an individual who has made some very interesting statements in the past. The member for Kings—Hants said, “Liberals believe that government, through government spending, can create better opportunities in Canada to keep Canadians here. I believe that if the government reduces taxes we can create better opportunities here”.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Marc Garneau (Westmount—Ville-Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today we learned that the fighter jet the government wants to buy, the F-35, cannot be refuelled mid-air unless, of course, we spend hundreds of millions of dollars more.

When will the Prime Minister wake up and launch an open competition to save taxpayers billions of dollars and to create thousands of guaranteed jobs?

• (1435)

[English]

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is not true. In fact, the F-35 will have refuelling capability and capacity. Lockheed Martin, the manufacturer of the plane, has confirmed that the F-35 can handle different types of refuelling systems, including the one currently used by our forces.

We are at least five years away from receipt of that first aircraft. We are working with Lockheed Martin and all the members of that consortium. I do not know why the member opposite and his party want to cancel the program that they started in 1997.

Mr. Marc Garneau (Westmount—Ville-Marie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the point is not whether it can be refuelled, it is the fact that the government forgot that there are hundreds of millions of dollars of extra cost because it did not plan for it. It is getting more expensive every day. Today we discover that this plane cannot be refuelled except by paying hundreds of millions of dollars more. How many hundreds of millions more and what else has the government forgotten to factor in?

When will the government come to its senses, hold a public competition, save Canadians billions of dollars and guarantee thousands of jobs?

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, any modifications with respect to refuelling will be done within the current budget allotted for the F-35.

What would cost our country a billion dollars, if not more, would be to cancel the procurement process that the member's party began.

We have seen this before. We have seen this story and it is a nightmare. It is called the Sea King replacement. Members opposite, in that case, cost the country a billion dollars and we still have not received those helicopters.

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. Jean Dorion (Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in 2010, on its website, Export Development Canada invited businesses here to invest in Tunisia, stating that Tunisia's political and economic environment was stable.

Is the minister not worried by the fact that his analysts came to that conclusion not long before the revolution in Tunisia?

[English]

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as we know, there have been significant changes in the political environment in Tunisia recently. Canada has enjoyed good export success in the past. Our hope is that as the situation normalizes there in the future, once again that kind of relationship could be established for the benefit of the citizens of both countries.

* * *

[Translation]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Jean Dorion (Longueuil—Pierre-Boucher, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government has said that members of the Ben Ali family are not welcome here, yet it has not frozen their assets in Canada.

Is the government aware that by not taking immediate action, the assets of Ben Ali's brother-in-law, for example, could fly off to tax havens and it would then be too late to recover them?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, we have been very clear about our relationship with Tunisia and with the family members. We have said time and time again, while respecting the rule of law, that these people are not welcome in Canada. We will look at every possible option to ensure that their assets are frozen.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mrs. Maria Mourani (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives' complacency and partisan attitude have made fraudster Vincent Lacroix a free man. The Bloc Québécois proposed many times that we fast-track the bill to abolish parole after one-sixth of a sentence is served. The Conservatives refused every time.

Does the government realize that it is responsible for the early release of Vincent Lacroix, who bilked thousands of small investors?

[English]

Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when we came to office, we inherited a justice system that was riddled with loopholes and favoured the convicted criminals as opposed to the interests of victims.

Slowly but surely we are reforming the criminal justice system in this country where victims can feel secure and criminals are behind bars.

Oral Questions

We would ask the Bloc, instead of opposing our legislation at every turn, to support us so that we can work together, whether it is white collar crime or other kinds of crime, so that those who should be in prison are in prison.

• (1440)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Maria Mourani (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, unlike the government's Bill C-39, the Bloc's bill applies to criminals who have already been sentenced. We need to take advantage of the consensus of the House and quickly do away with parole after one-sixth of a sentence because after Vincent Lacroix we have Earl Jones to worry about.

Will the government put aside partisan politics and start supporting the passage at all stages of the Bloc's bill to eliminate parole after one-sixth of a sentence?

[*English*]

Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is always interested in working with opposition parties in terms of reforming the criminal law and especially the parole system.

I know that we have a bill before the House. I would ask the opposition to agree unanimously to pass our bills in respect of public safety so that can be done in terms of protecting victims in this country.

* * *

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. Maria Minna (Beaches—East York, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just days before Christmas, front-line immigrant service agencies across Canada were blindsided when the Conservatives slashed their funding without reasons.

The South Asian Women's Centre in Toronto, which provided vital assistance to 14,000 newcomers last year, will have to close its doors and leave thousands of people without services. These agencies help new Canadians integrate into society and contribute to our economy.

Will the minister reverse these harmful cuts before it is too late?

Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism, CPC): Mr. Speaker, is that not an interesting question coming from an MP who sat in a government that shortchanged newcomers in settlement services for 13 long years, that imposed a \$1,000 head tax on newcomers and that froze settlement funding?

When we came to office, that government was only investing \$200 million in settlement services. We are investing \$600 million. This year we will see an increase in settlement services in seven of the ten provinces and in several parts of Ontario.

However, the funding needs to follow the newcomers. Relatively fewer newcomers are going to Toronto and relatively more are going to other parts of the country, which is good for Canada.

Hon. Maria Minna (Beaches—East York, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no answer but slander. That is fine.

The bulk of immigrants come to Ontario and others move to Ontario shortly after arriving. Under the current agreement, the current government owes Ontario \$207 million and, of the \$53 million cuts, \$43 million are in Ontario.

This decision is short-sighted and irresponsible.

How can the Conservatives find \$6 billion for unaffordable corporate tax cuts but cannot find the money we need for essential settlement services, specifically in Ontario?

Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when I was in opposition, we used to have a rule that when we were going to ask a question we would try to actually research it and know what we were talking about.

There are no federal transfers to Ontario for settlement funds and there never have been. There is no such agreement. What there is, though, is a federal investment this year of \$340 million in services to newcomers in Ontario. That compares to the \$100 million under the Liberal government.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Todd Russell (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, John Peyton is a boy in Labrador fighting childhood leukemia. His family members are with him every step of the way but they want help for all families who find themselves in similar circumstances.

The Peytons have started a grassroots campaign called John's Cause. With a moving YouTube video, they are calling for extended compassionate care benefits for parents of sick children. Families need help and children need help.

Why do the Conservatives choose corporate tax cuts for the richest rather than helping our Canadian families?

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government does want to help families that are in those kinds of situations.

That is why one of the first things we did was expand who would be eligible for compassionate care benefits, who could go and take care of their families. Our government also made it possible for the self-employed to voluntarily take part in a particular program of special EI benefits so that they too could get the time and the support to look after their loved ones.

• (1445)

Mr. Todd Russell (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister and her party just do not get it.

The big banks do not have children facing the greatest challenge of their lives. Corporate tax cuts do not allow families to be together in their darkest hours and to fight together.

On this side, our party has a plan to help children and families. Why do the Conservatives care more about corporate welfare and their corporate friends than the well-being of Canadian families?

Oral Questions

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have just demonstrated, our government does care. We have actually taken action to help families look after their families during times of illness.

The Liberals talk about having a plan. The sad thing is that the Liberals have had that plan for many years. Four times they promised to deliver it to Canadians and four times they failed. Why would any Canadian think that they would keep their promise this time?

* * *

PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada welcomes hundreds of thousands of newcomers from around the globe every year who are willing to work hard and play by the rules.

However, as government officials have recently confirmed, several criminal networks are preparing boats to smuggle illegal migrants into countries such as Canada.

Would the Minister of Public Safety update this House on our government's recent legislation that would stop human smugglers who profit by abusing Canada's generous immigration and refugee system?

Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, human smuggling is a despicable crime and any attempts to abuse Canada's generosity for financial gain are utterly unacceptable.

Our Conservative government has introduced needed legislation that presents fair, balanced and reasonable solutions to this problem. There is no more room for delay.

I would call on the Liberal-led coalition to reverse its threats and stop blocking this important legislation.

* * *

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are watching the situation in Egypt with a combination of hope and concern. We are hopeful the protestors' democratic aspirations will be realized peacefully and we are concerned about their safety.

The Conservatives' response has been tepid and disappointing. This is a moment for us to use our influence on the world stage and exert pressure on the Egyptian regime to respect democratic rights.

Canadians are speaking out loudly in support of human rights and democratic freedoms. Why is the government not doing the same?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, quite honestly, I do not know where the hon. colleague has been for the last 72 hours and beyond that.

Canada has been extremely forceful, not only in terms of its response to be able to evacuate Canadians on a voluntary basis from that country, which is under way but, as well, speaking out so that the regime that is in place in Egypt responds and listens to what the population is saying, that they bring forward reforms, both from an economic perspective as well as a democratic perspective. This is what the Government of Canada stands for.

Mr. Paul Dewar (Ottawa Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, let us fill in the blanks for the minister.

Our government must be unequivocal and principled in calling for a peaceful transition to a democratically elected government. That means support for an end to corruption, a re-running of the parliamentary elections and the recognition of legitimate political parties and presidential candidates.

Canadians support the democratic aspirations of the Egyptian people. Why will the government not do the same in real terms, not just in rhetoric?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned before, we are calling for a transition toward democratic reform.

It is exactly that position we have been putting forward. It is that position we have communicated to the government of Mr. Mubarak, and it is exactly that position the international community is pushing as well.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after saying in all seriousness that the oil extracted from the oil sands is ethical, and after promising a comprehensive plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, the Minister of the Environment is now telling us that he does not need one. In short, the government's approach when it comes to the environment is simple: it does nothing.

Are we to understand that the minister will continue, like his predecessors, to settle for inaction in order to better accommodate the oil companies and other major polluters?

● (1450)

Hon. Peter Kent (Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for her question.

[*English*]

We do have a plan and I wish my colleague would recognize that we are well on course to achieve our 2020 targets, our initial targets.

We will continue to regulate, sector by sector, the largest emitters. We began with transportation and electricity and we will proceed.

We fully intend to meet our commitments for 2020 to reduce greenhouse gases to 2005 levels by 17%.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy believes that it is time to act. The round table has criticized the government's approach, which consists of tying itself to the American agenda. If the government really wants to assume its environmental responsibilities, it must bring in a cap and trade system immediately.

Will the government finally come up with a comprehensive plan to effectively fight climate change?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Peter Kent (Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a continental cap and trade program is highly unlikely in the near future, and my colleague was very selective in forgetting to mention that the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy in fact complimented our government on our accomplishments to date.

We are committed to a regulatory approach and we are committed, where appropriate, where it makes sense, to align our strategy with that of the United States. Where it does not make sense, we will adopt a unique approach.

* * *

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Ms. Martha Hall Findlay (Willowdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what country did the government describe as Canada's most important export market in the Middle East? The UAE. Where, thanks to the government's pigheadedness, have some Canadians now been refused entry? The UAE. Where, thanks to the government's amateur level of diplomacy, the Toronto-based Circa Solar Energy, have to stop shipping product? The UAE.

How long will Canadians and Canadian jobs be penalized by the government's incompetence with regard to the UAE?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let us be clear. We said all along that when the UAE made an offer to Canada, it was not in Canada's best interests and we refused that offer.

Canada cannot obviously accept that a commercial request for landing rights in this country was linked to the use of our military camp in the UAE to support our efforts in Afghanistan.

These issues are issues that we take very seriously, but at the same time, we will not take any lessons from the—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Willowdale.

[Translation]

Ms. Martha Hall Findlay (Willowdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 27,000 Canadians live in the United Arab Emirates. Over 200 companies do business with them. These people are being held hostage because of the stubbornness of the Conservative government. Two examples are Cirque du Soleil and CAE in Montreal, which have several million dollars' worth of interests there.

When will the government show some maturity when it comes to managing our foreign affairs? When will it act in the interest of Canadians and restore healthy relations with this important Canadian ally?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think that basically everyone would like the opposition to take Canada's future and interests to heart. On this side of the House, we refuse to sign agreements that are not good for Canada and that are not in our country's best interests.

I want to make it clear that I wish that, instead of focusing on internationalism, they would support Canada's efforts on this issue.

*[English]***SPORTS**

Mr. Glenn Thibeault (Sudbury, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the NHL All-Star Game and, unfortunately, because of lingering effects of post-concussion syndrome, Sidney Crosby did not play, but "Sid the Kid" is not the only one sitting out these days. Across the country countless young athletes are needlessly suffering the same plight.

We have a concussion epidemic in this country, yet Conservatives cut federal funding for sports injury prevention research by 40%. When will the government restore this funding and take action to protect our young athletes?

● (1455)

Hon. Gary Lunn (Minister of State (Sport), CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying nobody likes to see overly aggressive hitting or fighting in any sport at any level.

Right now, amateur sport in Canada is receiving its highest level of funding in history. We are proud to support our athletes. We will continue to support Hockey Canada and its efforts to make sure that it continues to address this, as it is doing now.

Everybody in amateur hockey in Canada wears a helmet and that is the way it should be.

Mr. Glenn Thibeault (Sudbury, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is more of an issue than just wearing helmets. Everyone knows concussions are a serious problem and it is time for Canadian leadership.

Just this morning the U.S. Congress introduced a bill to protect athletes from concussions and serious sports injuries. Members of the Canadian athletic and medical community have repeatedly called on the government to help develop a strategy to better protect our young athletes.

Why is the government lagging behind the U.S. when it comes to reducing serious injuries and how many kids must be sidelined before we see some action?

Hon. Gary Lunn (Minister of State (Sport), CPC): Mr. Speaker, funding to amateur sport in Canada is happening at an unprecedented level, the highest in the history of this country, something that our government is very proud of. We will continue to support those organizations to continue to do their work, as we have done, but we are not going to start regulating the wearing of helmets in sports. We are going to leave that up to national sport organizations like Hockey Canada which, quite frankly, do a very good job.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. Steven Blaney (Lévis—Bellechasse, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative members from Quebec recognize how vital the forestry industry is to the economy in our regions. Unlike the Bloc members, who vote against the economic action plan and its billions of dollars, our Conservative government is taking action and is delivering the goods for Quebec.

Could my colleague, the Minister of State for the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec, bring us up to speed on our government's strategy to support the forestry industry and the economy in our regions?

Hon. Denis Lebel (Minister of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question.

With the softwood lumber agreement alone, this government managed to bring \$5 billion back into the country. A measure that we introduced, the pulp and paper green transformation program, is generating positive results for Quebec, to the tune of \$265 million in the regions of Quebec. Jobs are being saved and families are earning a living. Those are positive results.

Last week, the Forest Products Association of Canada declared, "The investments from the program...serve as an excellent example of smart policy and smart spending. It demonstrates a strong understanding of the transformation now taking place in Canada's... industry."

The Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

* * *

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives' decision to cancel funding for successful anti-gang programs in Winnipeg is going to drive at-risk youth back into the streets. These anti-gang programs are low cost and highly effective and were announced with great fanfare by two Conservative ministers in 2007. Today, however, Manitoba Conservative MPs refuse to explain the cuts.

I ask the Minister of Public Safety, how do bigger prisons and cuts to crime prevention make the streets of Winnipeg safer?

Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that particular member likes to talk about crime prevention measures but when it really counts she has consistently voted against such initiatives.

It is our Conservative government that created the national crime prevention strategy and the youth gang prevention fund. Our funding in that respect has been unequalled and certainly not matched by the Liberal governments.

I wish the member would stop her double-talk and actually support measures that keep dangerous criminals behind bars and give young people a chance to get out of gangs.

● (1500)

[Translation]

QUEBEC CITY ARENA

Mr. Michel Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Quebec has committed to financing up to 45% of a multi-purpose arena in Quebec City, up to a maximum of \$175 million. Of course, the governments' share would decrease based on contributions from the private sector.

Now that the private sector has committed, as the Conservatives demanded, will the federal government commit to matching the Government of Quebec's funding? That is all that is missing.

Hon. Josée Verner (Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister for La Francophonie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, someone needs to settle this matter, and it is obviously not going to be the Bloc members. Premier Charest also said that he does not need the Bloc to settle matters in Quebec. That said, our position has not changed for months now: we want to see a significant contribution from the private sector. The mayor is working to set up funding that must include the private sector. At this time, we have not received an official request or a clear proposal on this topic.

* * *

[English]

INDUSTRY

Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in Hamilton on Saturday, 10,000 people marched in solidarity with the 900 locked out workers and 9,000 retirees of U.S. Steel who are together at the forefront of fighting for decent jobs and pensions. They get it.

Without family-sustaining jobs there is no economic recovery. Without pension protection, seniors are being robbed of the retirements they have earned.

When will the government get it? When will it develop an industrial strategy that supports decent jobs? When will it take real action to make pensions a priority?

Mr. Mike Lake (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as U.S. Steel is in breach of its production and employment undertakings, this government continues to pursue a court action against the company.

What we have talked about is studying this at the industry committee. We look forward to studying the Investment Canada Act. We look forward to working with our colleagues from all parties to find a solution.

*Routine Proceedings***PUBLIC SAFETY**

Mrs. Tilly O'Neill-Gordon (Miramichi, CPC): Mr. Speaker, our government is focused on working for Canadians. We have a number of initiatives that will get criminals off the streets and make Canadian communities safer, including Bill C-23B, eliminating pardons and Bill C-39, ending early release. Canadians would like us to pass these important bills as soon as possible.

Could the Minister of Public Safety update the House on the status of these bills?

Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last session the Liberal-led coalition held up four important bills at the public safety committee that would make our streets and communities safer.

Today I call upon the opposition members to begin doing the work that Canadians expect them to do and return these bills back to the House for third reading and passage. Victims have waited long enough for these important measures to be passed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1505)
[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8)(b) I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 138 petitions.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

Hon. Shawn Murphy (Charlottetown, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics, in relation to a study of the privacy implications of a street-level imaging applications.

* * *

MAPLE LEAF AND TULIP DAY ACT

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-613, An Act respecting the friendship between Canada and the Netherlands.

He said: Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the efforts of Canadian military personnel and the Government of Canada in the 1930s and 1940s, Holland would not be a nation today. In fact, the people of the Netherlands are ever so grateful for the liberation of their country by Canada and her allies.

As a Dutch-born parliamentarian, it gives me great pleasure to introduce in the House legislation to recognize the actual liberation day of the Netherlands. From this day forward, May 5 shall be known as Maple Leaf and Tulip Day to honour and recognize the tremendous friendship between the Netherlands and Canada.

As we are aware, the Netherlands sends many tulips to Canada every year in recognition of that. There is no prouder leaf or flower out there than the maple leaf and the tulip. I encourage the heritage minister and all parliamentarians to pass this legislation as soon as possible.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)

* * *

DIVISION BELLS

Hon. Gordon O'Connor (Minister of State and Chief Government Whip, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations between all parties and I believe you will find unanimous support for the following motion. I move:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of any Standing Order, for the present session, when a recorded division is to be held on Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday, except recorded divisions deferred to the conclusion of oral questions, the bells to call in the Members shall be sounded for not more than thirty minutes.

The Speaker: Does the hon. chief government whip have the unanimous consent of the House to propose this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

PETITIONS

NATIONAL HOUSING STRATEGY

Mr. Robert Oliphant (Don Valley West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to present a petition in support of a national housing strategy. Over the past year, a group of petitioners has been working within my riding and beyond its borders to address the problem of a lack of affordable housing in the city of Toronto, and in parts of my riding in particular. The petitioners are calling upon us to engage all Canadians in a discussion regarding a national housing strategy. I will be asking that the human resources committee take that on.

AFGHANISTAN

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by dozens of Canadians to end Canada's military involvement in Afghanistan.

In May 2008, Parliament passed a resolution to withdraw Canadian Forces by July 2011. The Prime Minister, with agreement from the Liberal Party, broke his oft-repeated promise to honour the parliamentary motion and, furthermore, refuses to put it to a parliamentary vote in the House.

Routine Proceedings

Committing 1,000 soldiers to a training mission still presents a danger to our troops and an unnecessary expense when our country is faced with a \$56 billion deficit. The military mission has cost Canadians more than \$18 billion so far, money that could have been used to improve health care and seniors' pensions right here in Canada.

Polls show that a clear majority do not want Canada's military presence to continue after the scheduled removal date of July 2011. Therefore, the petitioners call upon the Prime Minister to honour the will of Parliament and bring the troops home now.

● (1510)

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

Ms. Kirsty Duncan (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to present a petition regarding chronic cerebrospinal venous insufficiency, or CCSVI, in multiple sclerosis.

Over 12,500 liberation procedures have been performed in over 50 countries. Bulgaria, Canada, Italy, Kuwait and the United States report that 80% to 97% of MS patients show one or more venous abnormalities. Interventional radiologists at recent conferences have suggested that one-third of MS patients treated have shown at least short-term significant benefit, and another one-third some benefit. The petitioners are therefore calling on the government to undertake clinical trials here in Canada, where 55,000 to 75,000 live with this devastating disease.

NATIONAL HOUSING STRATEGY

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to present three petitions.

I, too, am presenting petitions on the need for a national housing strategy, signed by many people in lots of communities right across the country, from British Columbia to Ontario. Folks have been working very hard to bring forward the urgent and critical need for a national housing strategy and the adoption of Bill C-304, which would ensure secure, adequate, accessible and affordable housing for Canadians. I hope this bill will come forward very soon.

SISTERS IN SPIRIT

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition concerns phase II of the Sisters in Spirit initiative and calls on the Government of Canada to renew the funding of the Native Women's Association of Canada.

This is a critical issue in my community of east Vancouver, where over 60 women have gone missing or been murdered. We know that across the country the number is now as high as nearly 600 aboriginal women and girls who have gone missing or have been murdered.

It is critical that this funding be continued for phase II, and the petition calls on the government to renew the funding.

OFFSHORE DRILLING

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have pages and pages of petitions from folks in British Columbia who are very concerned about the protection of B.C. waters from an oil disaster. They bring to our attention the Enbridge pipeline and supertankers the size of the Empire State Building that could operate

off the coast there. It will be a disaster if there is ever an accident. Therefore, the petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to immediately legislate the moratorium on offshore drilling and oil tanker traffic off B.C.'s coast.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

Ms. Irene Mathyssen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition addressed to the Government of Canada by Canadians of all ages and from all walks of life who genuinely support and value the contributions of our veterans. They regard a veteran as a veteran regardless of where or which deployment he or she may have served on.

The petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to extend the mandate of veterans hospitals to include veterans who have served in conflicts and peacekeeping operations since 1953; to end the clawback of veterans' pensions at age 65 and thereby eliminate the reduction of veteran's pensions at age 65; to change the widows benefit to a non-taxable benefit; to create a veteran advisory panel to provide input on the selection of future veterans ombudspersons; and to ensure that Veterans Affairs Canada remains a stand-alone department.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would ask you to please review the response by the Minister of Public Safety to my question. I would submit that the language he used was unparliamentary and misleading. One can have one's opinion, but one does not make up the facts. I do ask that you review *Hansard* and come to a conclusion on it.

The Speaker: Very well.

* * *

● (1515)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with routine proceedings, let me just say on my part and that of all members of the government, congratulations to you on your recent 10-year anniversary of being Speaker of this House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: It is well deserved, sir.

Routine Proceedings

The following questions will be answered today: Nos. 545, 547, 550, 553, 558, 562, 563, 565, 574, 575, 580, 582, 585, 590, 592, 594, 601, 609, 618, 619, 625, 629, 630, 633, 636, 641, 646, 647, 648, 649, 651, 654, 656, 658, 675, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 694, 695, 697, 700, 701, 702, 703, 705, 706, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 742, 745, 748, 770, 771, 772, 773, 777, 778, 779, 780, 782, 783, 784, 786, 787, 789, 790, 791, and finally Question No. 806.

[Text]

Question No. 545—**Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours:**

With regard to the trade in illicit tobacco products: (a) when will the Minister of Revenue publish the technical rules relating to the stamping regime which was created in Budget 2010 to combat contraband tobacco; (b) when did the Canada Revenue Agency first develop the stamp as a solution to contraband tobacco; (c) when were licensed tobacco manufacturers first consulted on the requirement to affix these stamps to their packages; (d) by how much will each stamp increase the cost of a single package of tobacco products; and (e) what impact does the government expect the stamping regime will have on the manufacturing and sale of contraband tobacco and why?

Hon. Keith Ashfield (Minister of National Revenue, Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the response from the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) to the above-noted question follows.

In response to (a), technical rules for the stamping regime will be elaborated through public announcements, excise duty notices and the publication of proposed regulatory amendments in the Canada Gazette, entitled Regulations Amending the Stamping and Marking of Tobacco Products Regulations. In 2010, duty notices were released on the CRA website in July and September, and a consultation draft of the regulations was released to industry, provinces and other stakeholders in November 2010. CRA officials continue to work with officials at both the Department of Justice and the Treasury Board Secretariat to publish the proposed regulations in the Canada Gazette by January of 2011.

In response to (b), as early as 2003, CRA officials were reviewing various initiatives that might respond to the growing issue of the proliferation of contraband tobacco; one option that specifically responded to the challenge of counterfeit and other illicitly produced tobacco products was the concept of enhancing Canada's excise tobacco stamping regime with a new tobacco excise stamp.

One element of the tobacco compliance strategy was a new enhanced stamping regime based on the development of a new state-of-the-art tobacco excise stamp. This was delineated in the federal budget of 2005.

In response to (c), in February 2005 the CRA began approaching several tobacco manufacturers individually to attain a better understanding of their production facilities and packaging lines for purposes of the adoption of a new excise duty tobacco stamp to be affixed to tobacco product packages. In July 2005, the CRA publicly released a discussion paper entitled "Tobacco Stamping Regime — Review and Recommendations" to seek representations from various stakeholders. Consultations have been ongoing since the 2005 federal budget announcement. In January 2008 the CRA invited all tobacco licensees to an information session.

In response to (d), following the federal budget of 2005, the CRA conducted a competitive procurement process that resulted in the award of a contract to design, produce and distribute a tobacco stamp incorporating overt and covert security features. The contract was awarded on January 3, 2008, and specifies a firm unit price of \$0.00592 per stamp which could, if added on, result in an increase of just over one-half cent to the cost of a stamped tobacco product.

In response to (e), the new stamp contains state-of-the-art overt and covert security features that will enable all levels of the supply and distribution chain, from producer to consumer, to identify legitimate duty-paid tobacco products from contraband. The government expects that the new stamping regime will contribute to reducing the amount of counterfeit and other illicitly produced tobacco products entering the Canadian market. This will result in the enhanced integrity of the tobacco tax system, which supports the Government's health objectives.

Question No. 547—**Mr. Marc Garneau:**

With regard to Statistics Canada and the census: (a) is Statistics Canada currently spending money to assess the value of the data it will collect from the new, voluntary National Household Survey (NHS) as compared to the value of the data previously collected from the mandatory long-form census; and (b) is Statistics Canada transferring any questions from the NHS to the 2011 Census of Population questionnaire which would render the questionnaire different from that published in the Canada Gazette, Part I on August 21, 2010?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with regard to Statistics Canada and the census, in response to (a), Statistics Canada is currently focusing its efforts on developing, assessing and adapting its statistical and operational procedures to minimize non-response bias and to achieve the best quality possible from the national household survey. Only when data collection is complete will we begin to assess the actual data quality using a number of measures, including comparison to data from 2006 long-form census and use of the 2011 census short-form results. Until then, the quality-related costs of the 2011 Census of Population and the national household survey cannot be segregated.

Statistics Canada is confident that the national household survey will produce usable and useful data that can meet the needs of many users.

In response to (b), the 2011 census questionnaire will contain the same questions as published in the Canada Gazette, Part I, on August 21, 2010.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 550—Hon. Dominic LeBlanc:**

With regard to Statistics Canada and the census: (a) how much money did Statistics Canada project would be required to ensure the quality and accuracy of the data of the now defunct 2011 mandatory long-form census; (b) how much money does Statistics Canada expect will be required to ensure the quality and accuracy of the data of the new National Household Survey, which is to replace the mandatory long-form census; and (c) if the amount in (a) differs from the corresponding amount in (b), what explains this difference?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with regard to Statistics Canada and the census, in response to part (a), Statistics Canada received a budget of \$630 million for the 2011 census program. Every component of the census and national household survey, NHS, planning and implementation of operations, such as systems development and testing, interviewer hiring and training and collection and follow-up design contributes to ensuring data quality. Due to the integrated nature of the quality assurance measures in place for the census program, quality-related costs cannot be segregated.

In response to (b), Statistics Canada is projecting expenditures of \$630 million for the 2011 census and NHS. Statistics Canada is adapting its procedures to conduct the 2011 census and NHS within the existing budget initially planned for a mandatory short- and long-form census.

In response to (c), Statistics Canada will conduct the 2011 Census and the new NHS with the resources provided.

Question No. 553—Ms. Megan Leslie:

With regard to the government's decision to terminate the development of an HIV vaccine manufacturing facility: (a) on what date was the Public Health Agency of Canada first informed that the Gates Foundation had commissioned a report to analyze the current vaccine manufacturing capacity in North America and Europe; (b) on what date was the Public Health Agency of Canada first informed of the results of the report commissioned by the Gates Foundation to analyze current vaccine manufacturing capacity in North America and Europe; (c) what were the dates of each meeting, including in person meetings and meetings conducted via teleconference, between the Public Health Agency of Canada and the Gates Foundation regarding the report commissioned by the Gates Foundation and the changes to the Canadian HIV Vaccine Initiative; and (d) on what date was the Minister or the Minister's office first informed of the report and requested changes made by the Gates Foundation concerning the Canadian HIV Vaccine Initiative?

Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the response to (a) is that the initial cornerstone of the Canadian HIV vaccine initiative (CHVI) announced in February 2007 was the establishment in Canada of a pilot-scale HIV vaccine manufacturing facility to produce clinical trial lots. The facility was intended to address the global shortage in pilot-scale manufacturing initially identified by the Global HIV Vaccine Enterprise, an alliance of independent organizations around the world dedicated to accelerating the development of preventive HIV vaccines.

Consultations were held in late 2007 by CHVI participating departments/agencies, including the Canadian International Development Agency, Public Health Agency of Canada, Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Health Canada and Industry Canada and the Gates Foundation, to seek expert input on how to move forward with establishing a facility in Canada. Based on this consultation, a process was launched in April 2008 to select a not-for-profit corporation to build, operate and manage the facility.

As part of the participating departments/agencies' and Gates Foundation's review processes, both the participating departments/

agencies and the Gates Foundation received input from external experts and undertook internal analyses related to value for money and other factors. On March 17, 2009, the Public Health Agency of Canada was informed that an analysis of the current vaccine manufacturing capacity in North America and Europe would be part of the Gates Foundation's internal review process.

The response to (b) is that in late June 2009, the Gates Foundation informally shared preliminary results of the report with the Public Health Agency of Canada. The study results were presented to officials from participating CHVI departments/agencies on July 16, 2009.

The response to (c) is that further to regular informal discussions, two teleconferences between participating CHVI departments/agencies and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation were held on July 16th and July 31st to discuss the report. In addition, face-to-face meetings and/or teleconferences were held on September 28, 2009; December 21, 2009; March 2, 25 and 26, 2010; April 15, 22 and 29, 2010; May 6, 13, 20 and 27, 2010; and, June 3, 17 and 24, 2010 to discuss the renewal of the CHVI. In July 2010, at the XVIII International AIDS Conference in Vienna, Austria, the Government of Canada and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation renewed their commitment of up to \$139 million to implement the Canadian HIV vaccine initiative.

The response to (d) is that the minister's office was informed of the report following the July 2009 teleconference between participating CHVI departments/agencies and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Given the importance of the CHVI and continuing commitment amongst partners to making progress on overall objectives, all options were examined to yield the best results.

This was an important decision that the Government of Canada and the Gates Foundation could not take lightly nor make quickly. The decision was based on a number of factors. A thorough, evidence-based review of all applications was completed. This included an internal review and external review by an international expert panel. None of the applicants were found to be successful in meeting the pre-established criteria.

Additionally, as part of the due diligence process, the Gates Foundation commissioned a study on vaccine manufacturing capacity. This study demonstrated that there was sufficient vaccine manufacturing capacity in North America and Europe to meet research needs.

After weighing all of the evidence, the Government of Canada and the Gates Foundation decided not to proceed with the vaccine manufacturing facility.

Routine Proceedings

Question No. 558—Ms. Meili Faille:

Regarding the Competition Bureau's investigation, initiated in 2005, and the charges in 2009 against information technology (IT) services companies against which Public Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) has levelled allegations of anti-competitive bid-rigging: (a) what are the names of the people from PWGSC, the Competition Bureau and the Public Prosecution Service of Canada (PPSC) who engaged in discussion or correspondence regarding the investigation and, if applicable, for each communication, (i) when did the communication take place, (ii) at what stage was the investigation, (iii) what matters were discussed, (iv) was there consensus on the action to take, (v) what is the description of the consensus; (b) during the period from June 1, 2008 to July 31, 2008, what are the names and titles of the people who made inquiries to the Competition Bureau about the stage of the investigation from (i) PWGSC, (ii) the Competition Bureau, (iii) the PPSC, (iv) Canada Border Services Agency, (v) Transport Canada, (vi) the Prime Minister's Office; (c) were inquiries made to the PPSC or the Competition Bureau by people other than those identified in (b) and, if so, what is the name of each person and the date of the inquiry; (d) did the PWGSC Deputy Minister discuss the inquiry with the PPSC and the Competition Bureau and, if so, (i) when did these discussions take place, (ii) what was the content of these discussions, (iii) was the lawsuit brought by one of the companies named in the charges discussed and, if so, what is the name of the company; (e) can Competition Bureau lawyers work simultaneously for PWGSC; (f) can PPSC lawyers work simultaneously for PWGSC; (g) for the period from June 1, 2008 to March 31, 2009, (i) what recommendations were made to PWGSC by the lawyers identified in (e) and (f), (ii) what are the names of these lawyers, (iii) were these lawyers informed of a lawsuit against PWGSC brought by one of the companies named in the Competition Bureau charges; (h) were Mr. Denis Pilon and Mr. V. Chénard, lawyers named by the government in a criminal case, denounced by the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner; (i) regarding the PPSC's hiring of Mr. Denis Pilon, (i) what was the date of hire, (ii) what are the names of the people who made recommendations or suggestions or commented on the hiring of Mr. Pilon, (iii) who made the decision to ask Mr. Pilon to handle the file on the IT companies named in the Competition Bureau charges, (iv) were Mr. Pilon's political activities for the Conservative Party declared and, if so, who informed the PPSC of these activities; (j) regarding the PPSC, the Competition Bureau and the various departments involved in the case, was a study or an audit done on the quality of work performed by the companies involved in the alleged bid-rigging and, if so, (i) what was the assessment of the various departments of each company, (ii) what was the title of the document containing the studies or audits, (iii) on what date were these studies or audits done; (k) regarding the PPSC, the Competition Bureau and the various departments involved in the case, was a study or an audit done on the market impact of the alleged bid-rigging and, if so, (i) on what date were these studies or audits done, (ii) what was the title of the document containing this information, (iii) what were the key findings and recommendations; (l) regarding PWGSC's plan in December 2008 and January 2009 to debar the companies that allegedly rigged bids for IT services, (i) who, within PWGSC, the Competition Bureau or the PPSC, proposed this idea, (ii) was the basic principle of Canadian law that a person is innocent until proven guilty discussed, (iii) did the person responsible for the debarment decide to disregard the principle set out in (ii), (iv) did PWGSC subsequently assure one or more of the companies in question that they would not be debarred and, if applicable, what companies and why, (v) did PWGSC warn one or more departments that these companies might be debarred, (vi) after withdrawing its threat of immediate debarment, did PWGSC inform one or more departments to act as if nothing had happened with these companies, while awaiting the court's decision, (vii) did PWGSC urge one or more departments to do whatever was necessary to prevent these companies from accessing business opportunities or contracts, (viii) for each circumstance in (i), (ii), (iv), (v), (vi) and (vii), on what date did the communication take place; (m) did PWGSC senior officials provide instructions to avoid sending written information on certain lawsuits that risked being the subject of a possible access to information or privacy request and, if so, who gave this instruction and for what reason; (n) can the PPSC, the Competition Bureau and the departments involved confirm that they still have all the evidence in their possession; (o) were the companies named in the Competition Bureau's charges subject to greater scrutiny regarding their commercial activities with the government and, if so, (i) what are the names of the PWGSC employees given this task and (ii) which departments were contacted; and (p) is PWGSC involved in evaluating the proposals or in the contract adjudication process and, if so, (i) to what extent are PWGSC public servants involved, (ii) what is the objective, (iii) what follow-up and communication procedures are in place between PWGSC and the departments regarding these cases, (iv) is there a document describing these procedures, and (v) have these procedures largely been followed?

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of Justice, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Public Prosecution Service of Canada, PPSC, is an independent

prosecution service whose mandate is to provide prosecutorial advice to law enforcement agencies and to prosecute offences under federal jurisdiction. The PPSC performs these functions in a manner that is free of any improper influence and that respects the public interest.

The questions above seek information in respect of matters that are currently the subject of a criminal prosecution and civil litigation before the courts. Accordingly, it would be inappropriate to respond to these questions at this time.

Question No. 562—Hon. Bob Rae:

With regard to the current renewed peace talks in the Middle East: (a) in what meetings has the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) participated regarding the renewed peace talks; (b) what briefing notes has DFAIT received or produced regarding the renewed peace talks; (c) what scenarios has DFAIT prepared for a Canadian role in the renewed peace talks; and (d) what scenarios has DFAIT prepared for a renewed Canadian role with the Refugee Working Group?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), Canada has not participated in meetings surrounding the renewed peace talks. These meetings have been largely restricted to the parties and the U.S., with some regional and Quartet participation.

In response to (b), DFAIT closely monitors developments on the peace process and a briefing note on the Middle East peace process is updated as appropriate.

In response to (c) and (d), as stated publicly on many occasions, including a statement in support of the continuation of peace talks on October 9, Canada is ready to assist the parties in any way they find helpful.

Question No. 563—Hon. Bob Rae:

With regard to the flooding in Pakistan in late July 2010: (a) how much money has the government matched in donations from Canadian citizens; (b) to which organizations has the money from the matching program gone; (c) how much additional money has the government spent on the prevention of disease in Pakistan; (d) how much additional money has the government spent on the reconstruction of Pakistan; and (e) has the government looked into any other programs besides direct economic aid to help the people of Pakistan?

Hon. Bev Oda (Minister of International Cooperation, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), individual Canadians have demonstrated their generosity and concern for the people of Pakistan by donating more than \$46.8 million to registered Canadian charities for flood relief. The Government of Canada will place an equivalent amount to the eligible donations in the Pakistan flood relief fund.

Routine Proceedings

In response to (b), as of November 16, 2010, the following organizations have received financial support from the Pakistan flood relief fund: United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, \$6 million; United Nations World Food Programme, \$4.5 million; Canadian Red Cross Society, \$2 million; Save the Children Canada, \$3.5 million; Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace, \$2 million; CANADEM, \$590,000; GlobalMedic, \$410,000; The total as November 16, 2010 is \$19 million.

In response to (c), within the context of the 2010 monsoon floods, the Government of Canada has provided \$16.42 million—\$410,000 to GlobalMedic under the Pakistan flood relief fund, plus an additional \$16.01 million outside of the Pakistan flood relief fund to United Nations organizations, Red Cross Red Crescent Movement and Canadian NGOs—toward the prevention of disease in Pakistan through initiatives aimed at providing emergency health care, clean water and sanitation, and hygiene promotion to the flood-affected population.

In response to (d), as of November 16, 2010, the Government of Canada has not supported any reconstruction activities in Pakistan within the context of the 2010 monsoon floods. The Government of Canada was recently presented with the Government of Pakistan's federal and provincial reconstruction strategies at a multinational Pakistan Development Forum in Islamabad. The Government of Canada is currently reviewing these strategies. To date, the Canadian International Development Agency's response to floods in Pakistan totals \$44 million, including \$19 million from the Pakistan flood relief fund.

In response to (e), the Government of Canada, through the Canadian International Development Agency, will continue to focus development assistance programs on education and women's economic empowerment. When it is available, the Government of Canada will review the Government of Pakistan's reconstruction plan. The Government of Canada will also continue to monitor the humanitarian situation in Pakistan.

Question No. 565—Hon. Shawn Murphy:

With respect to persons who have accompanied the Prime Minister on foreign and domestic trips, for the period January 1, 2006 to October 11, 2010: (a) in what capacity does image consultant Michelle Muntean travel on transportation provided by the government; (b) does Ms. Muntean receive any remuneration from the government; (c) on what trips did Ms. Muntean travel with the Prime Minister; (d) what was the total cost associated with Ms. Muntean's travel, broken down by the amount spent on (i) transportation, (ii) accommodations, (iii) per diems, (iv) meals, (v) all other expenses; (e) which government department or agency paid for expenses incurred as a result of Ms. Muntean's travel; (f) have any outside individuals, groups or organizations paid for any of Ms. Muntean's travel expenses; (g) what bills have been sent to individuals, groups or organizations for Ms. Muntean's travel expenses; (h) what are the names of the individuals, other than Ms. Muntean, not employed by the government, excluding the Prime Minister's spouse and children, who have accompanied the Prime Minister on domestic or foreign travel; (i) in what capacity did the individuals in (h) travel on transportation provided by the government; (j) on what trips have the individuals in (h) traveled with the Prime Minister; (k) for the individuals in (h), what was the total cost associated with their travel, broken down by the amount spent on (i) transportation, (ii) accommodations, (iii) per diems, (iv) meals, (v) all other expenses; (l) which government department or agency paid for the expenses in (k); (m) have any outside individuals, groups or organizations paid for any of the travel expenses in (k); and (n) what bills have been sent to the individuals, groups or organizations in (m)?

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Privy Council Office has no

records or information on travel expenses for non-government individuals between January 1, 2006 and October 11, 2010.

Question No. 574—Mr. Dennis Bevington:

With regard to federal regulation of the lands in the Northwest Territories, in detail: (a) what was the rationale for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development's recommendation that the subsurface interim land withdrawal for Edehzhie Candidate National Wildlife Area not be renewed; (b) prior to making the recommendation, did the department consult with the Dehcho First Nations and, if so, (i) when were the consultations conducted, (ii) how were they conducted, (iii) where were they conducted, (iv) what was their outcome; and (c) if no consultations were conducted with the Dehcho First Nations, what were the reasons?

Hon. John Duncan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians and Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), a national wildlife area designation does not preclude development. The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is of the view that well-managed resource development can co-exist with protected areas. For this reason, the minister felt that the process to establish the Edehzhie Candidate National Wildlife Area did not require an interim land withdrawal removing from disposition the subsurface rights.

The response to (b), is no.

In response to (c), consultations were not deemed to be required.

Question No. 575—Mr. Scott Simms:

With regard to the May 2010 changes to the Functional Guidance and Procedures for Registered Retirement Income Fund (RRIF) withdrawals and Guaranteed Income Supplement (GIS) adjustments: (a) what was the rationale behind changing the guidelines, such that seniors who voluntarily withdraw funds from their RRIFs may no longer be eligible for GIS, Allowance, or Allowance for survivors benefits; (b) why is there a distinction such that seniors who withdraw funds from a RRIF are penalized, while it is possible to withdraw the same amount from a savings account without impacting GIS eligibility and payment amounts; (c) who was responsible for the decision to make these changes; and (d) in light of the recommendation from The Honourable Justice E.A. Bowie and The Honourable Justice J.E. Hershfield of the Tax Court of Canada that this policy should be reviewed, what has the government done to examine the effects of these procedures and ensure that they are in the best interest of Canadian citizens?

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the guaranteed income supplement, GIS, is intended for old age security. OAS, pensioners who have little or no income other than their basic OAS pension. Accordingly, the determination of the entitlement to the GIS benefit is based on income and marital status. The GIS is targeted towards low-income seniors. It is income-tested to ensure that the highest benefits are provided to the lowest-income seniors.

Routine Proceedings

In response to (a), the administrative policy changes introduced in May 2010 were small and technical in nature. In general, an individual's GIS benefit is re-calculated every year in July, based on their previous year's income. Under the Old Age Security Act, there exists an "option" provision that allows pensioners to have their GIS benefit based on an estimate of their current income, in very limited circumstances when there is a drop in income as a result of: a cessation of employment income; or a reduction or termination of pension income, for example, liquidation of a RRIF, or the insolvency of a pension fund. Its purpose is not to exclude income from the calculation of the GIS benefit. The change that the May 2010 policy introduced was intended to better clarify under which circumstances the "option" provision could be used in relation to RRIF.

In response to (b), since its inception in 1967, GIS benefits have been calculated on the basis of income as defined under the Income Tax Act, ITA. This includes, among others, Canada pension plan, CPP, benefits, employer and private pensions, as well as registered retirement savings plan, RRSP, and RRIF withdrawals. Amounts from a savings account are not considered as income under the ITA. Therefore, given that the GIS is an income-tested program, withdrawals from a RRIF are considered as an income in the calculation of GIS benefits while withdrawals from personal savings accounts are not.

In response to (c), the decision was made by officials at the Department of Human Resources and Skills Development Canada without the knowledge of the minister or minister's office staff.

In response to (d), departmental officials regularly review all policies and programs to ensure that they are in the best interest of Canadian citizens.

In this particular instance, the minister cancelled the change once it was discovered that the change had been made and that it could have unintended consequences.

Question No. 580—Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:

With regard to the \$1.5 billion dedicated to the Canada ecoTrust for Clean Air and Climate Change in Budget 2007, for each of the fiscal years 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011: (a) what is the total amount of funding that was allotted; (b) what were the major environmental projects funded; (c) who were the beneficiaries of the funding allotted; (d) in which provinces or territories were the beneficiaries of funding located; (e) how many jobs were maintained as a result of the funding allotted; and (f) how many jobs were created as a result of the funding?

Hon. Peter Kent (Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), in February 2007, the \$1.5 billion clean air and climate change trust fund was established to support those provinces and territories that identify major projects that will result in real reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and air pollutants.

In response to (b), while the Government of Canada transferred the funding to provincial and territorial governments through the trust, it is provincial and territorial responsibility to report directly to their residents, to their legislative assemblies, and their auditors on how they spend public funds, including reporting on how they used funding through the clean air and climate change trust fund.

Two types of approaches are apparent. First, some provinces and territories are using trust fund resources to directly finance specific projects. For example, Nova Scotia used its funds to establish

ecoNova Scotia to support projects to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases and air pollution. Through 69 funded projects and programs in 2009, the initiative is projected to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 172 kilotonnes, Kt, a year. Alberta directed approximately \$80 million of the fund towards 10 projects focusing on, among other goals, technology advancement and leveraging further investments. These projects are projected to provide three megatonnes, Mt, of reductions by 2015.

Yukon directed its funds towards the installation of a third hydro turbine at the Aishihik hydro electric plant in south western Yukon. The Aishihik third turbine will be operational by the end of 2010 and will produce 3.8 Kt of emission reductions annually. New Brunswick dedicated resources towards landfill gas recovery projects, with three of these projects using the captured methane gas for power generation. This will result in 165 Kt of GHG emission reductions.

Second, other provinces have used the trust fund to help finance their overall climate change strategies. For example, Trust Fund resources have been used in Ontario to help finance a broad range of initiatives under its climate change action plan, including improving access to energy efficient technologies, increasing use of renewable energy sources, deploying new technologies to abate emissions, and public transit. Ontario has also committed to eliminate coal-fired generation by the end of 2014.

In Quebec the trust fund has been used to provide additional funding for its suite of climate change measures under its 2006-2012 action plan on climate change. These resources have been added to Quebec's green fund, to supplement funds collected through the green fund duty.

In Saskatchewan the trust fund has been used to support a wide variety of provincial investments being pursued towards the reduction of GHG emissions. These investments include the establishment of the go green fund, which provides financial support for the development and deployment of clean energy technologies, energy efficiency initiatives, renewable energy and wind power projects, and carbon capture and storage projects.

The Government of Canada has made a number of joint announcements with provinces and territories regarding the planned expenditures under this Trust, and in many cases provinces have publicly acknowledged the use of Trust Fund resources in their budget and project announcements. Details on planned expenditures for each province and territory are listed on the following Web site: <http://www.ecoaction.gc.ca/trust-fiducie-eng.cfm>.

In response to (c), the beneficiaries of the clean air and climate change trust fund are each of the provinces and territories, and through them, their residents and municipalities. Provinces and territories have the flexibility to draw the funds over three years according to their respective schedule and priorities.

Routine Proceedings

The trust fund is allocated on a per capita basis and provides a minimum of \$15 million per province and \$5 million per territory to support efforts to develop technology, improve energy efficiency, and undertake other projects that will result in significant environmental benefits.

In response to (d), see the response to (c). Each province and territory was allocated funding. (

In response to (e) and (f), while the Government of Canada provided funding to provincial and territorial governments through the trust, it is provincial and territorial governments themselves that are responsible for allocating the funds to specific programs. Provinces and territories are responsible for reporting directly to their residents, to their legislative assemblies, and their auditors on how they spend public funds, including reporting on how they used funding through the clean air and climate change trust fund. Provincial and territorial governments are not required to report to the federal government.

Question No. 582—Mr. Anthony Rota:

With respect to the inspections of gas pumps and other measuring devices mandated in Bill C-14, An Act to amend the Electricity and Gas Inspection Act and the Weights and Measures Act, of the present session of the 40th Parliament: (a) what is the expected cost to the owner of an average establishment in a rural community in each of the trade sectors identified in the Bill, for each aspect of a trip taken by a non-government inspector specifically for the mandatory inspection of each of the measuring devices utilized in the conduct of their trade; (b) what studies, if any, have been conducted which examine, centrally or peripherally, the cost of the examinations cited in the Bill; and (c) what are the results of the studies referred to in (b)?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), the fees charged by non-government inspectors to conduct mandatory inspections would be determined by market forces rather than the government. The current fees for inspections performed by non-government inspectors are expected to decline with the introduction of mandatory inspection requirements due to efficiencies gained through the economies of scale resulting from increased demand for inspection services and competition for business among non-government inspectors.

Measurement Canada has surveyed current non-government inspection fees. These fees are typically between \$50 and \$200 per device inspection. This represents a minor incremental increase over service contracts that responsible device owners typically have in place for maintenance of their devices.

Many non-government inspectors are currently located in non-urban communities such as Prince George, Saguenay, Thunder Bay, Timmins and Sudbury, and it is expected that services to rural communities will increase once Bill C-14 becomes law.

For the following sample costs, based on current non-government inspection fees, the assumption is that a non-government inspector would need to travel three hours to perform the inspection. It is unlikely that travel costs such as these would be applied in this manner, as many non-government inspectors are located in non-urban centres and would schedule multiple inspection activities in a geographic region for reasons of efficiency. If the non-government inspector performs examination activities at the same time as service work, no additional travel costs would be incurred by the device owner.

Examples of costs are as follows: for a device owner in the retail petroleum sector with four gas pumps that need to be certified, the cost would be approximately \$90 per pump every two years. For the owner of four small platform scales, e.g. scales capable of measuring up to 50 kg, employed in any trade sector, the cost of the inspection and certification would be approximately \$125 per device every two years. For the owner of four computing scales, e.g. scales found at a grocery store checkout, used in the retail food trade sector, the cost would be approximately \$125 per device every five years. If

Measurement Canada conducted these inspections and uncovered non-compliance issues, the device owner would be required to call in a service organization to repair and recalibrate the devices. This legislative proposal will allow issues to be corrected immediately upon detection by non-government inspectors, an efficiency that will reduce device owners' costs as well as enhance consumer protection.

Inspection costs are minimal considering the value of goods purchased and sold annually, and the possible negative implications for both device owners and consumers. For example, a typical gas pump measures approximately \$500,000 worth of product over a two-year period.

In response to (b) and (c), the Birch report, a case study conducted in 2003 by the Organisation Internationale de la Métrologie Légale, used Canadian device compliance rates to estimate the "dollars at risk" for each type of device. When these figures were related to the cost of certification activities performed by government agencies, it was found that, for each dollar spent, \$11 of inaccurate measurement was corrected. It was also found that, on average, total trade measurement inequity comprised 65% short measure, i.e., in favour of the device owner, and 35% over measure, i.e., in favour of the consumer.

In the same report it was stated that when the value of goods measured across trade measurement devices was determined and combined with the performance of these devices, the estimated benefit-cost ratio of the inspection system was found to be 11.4 for periodic inspection and 28.7 for targeted inspection. Periodic inspections would be equivalent to the mandatory frequencies that could be established as a result of Bill C-14 and targeted inspections are inspections of known problem areas.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 585—Mr. Anthony Rota:**

With respect to the 2010 strategic review of the Canada Student Loan Program within Human Resources and Skills Development Canada: (a) which programs within the Canada Student Loan Program have been reviewed as a part of the comprehensive strategic review process; (b) which programs within the Canada Student Loan Program have been identified as low-priority through strategic review; (c) which programs within the Canada Student Loan Program have been identified as low-performing through strategic review; (d) which programs within the Canada Student Loan Program have been identified as suitable options for funding reallocation through strategic review; (e) what is the total value of all program funding identified as suitable for reallocation through strategic review; (f) what program priorities will the funding reallocation be allotted to through strategic review; and (g) has the Canada Student Loan Program identified options for potential savings beyond the five percent required under the strategic review guidelines?

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as announced by the President of the Treasury Board on May 3, 2010, Human Resources and Skills Development Canada is going through the strategic review process this year. As part of this process, departments and agencies review 100% of their programs, including operation costs of statutory programs such as the Canada student loans program, with a view to better focus programs and services, streamline internal operations and transform the way they do business and achieve better results for Canadians. In this way, federal organizations are better able to increase efficiencies and effectiveness, focus on core roles, and meet the priorities of Canadians.

The strategic review process is an effective tool to help control the growth of spending. It is a mechanism that allows the government to reallocate funding from low-priority, low-performing programs to higher priorities for Canadians, based on a comprehensive review of all programs. Strategic reviews are designed to ensure that government programs are efficient and effective and achieve results Canadians expect.

The results of the 2010 strategic reviews will be released in budget 2011.

Question No. 590—Mr. Marc Garneau:

With respect to the government's negotiations to purchase F-35 Joint Strike Fighter aircraft from the United States, has the government negotiated or obtained any concessions concerning Trade in Arms Regulations?

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, given the multinational character of the JSF program and the global nature of the supply chain, the JSF partnership has been highly proactive in the development of a unique export control regime to accommodate the United States' International Traffic in Arms Regulations, ITAR, which control the export of defence-related articles and services identified on the United States Munitions List.

First, the JSF partners have negotiated the establishment of a working group, the international matters working group, dedicated to identifying and addressing any export control issues that detract from the successful execution of the program.

Second, the partnership is making every effort to expedite export licensing with the United States government, even dedicating people to address JSF-related export licensing. This has greatly improved export licensing times, with the average JSF licence being executed in less than 30 days rather than the typical 45 to 120 days.

Finally, the partnership is also addressing export control issues related to the sustainment of the F-35, with an innovative process being developed to ensure the rapid transfer of technological items from one partner to another, including industry in partner nations. Under the current process, every transfer between industries or between industries and governments requires a separate re-transfer authorization. Given the thousands of weekly transfers anticipated in the sustainment phase of the JSF program, such an arrangement is unworkable. The JSF partnership is, therefore, working towards a revolutionary regime whereby re-transfer authorizations are eliminated for all companies and governments identified and cleared by the regime.

Question No. 592—Hon. John McKay:

With respect to the government's stated policy of returning the budget to balance: (a) what are the summaries, item by item, of all of the government programs, services, operating costs and all other cost categories that have increased (above the rate of inflation) for the fiscal years from 2006-2007 to 2010-2011; (b) what are all budgetary items that the government will freeze or cut in order to achieve a balanced budget and in which fiscal year(s) will these freezes or cuts take place; (c) how will these savings balance against the Bank of Canada's projected annual revenues of the government; (d) does the government plan to raise taxes to eliminate the deficit and, if so, which taxes; and (e) does the government plan to sell any of its assets in order to eliminate the deficit and, if so, which assets?

Hon. Jim Flaherty (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, In response to (a), details on the spending of the federal government can be found in the Public Accounts of Canada. The Public Accounts of Canada are archived in the Library and Archives Canada's electronic collection at <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/electroniccollection/index-e.html>. For information on planned expenses for 2010-11, please consult the main and supplementary estimates at <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/est-pre/index-eng.asp>. The main and supplementary estimates provide a breakdown of planned spending by standard object of expenditure that can be compared to previous years Public Accounts.

In response to (b), budget 2010, see pages 156 to 168, implemented a number of targeted measures to bring the budget back to balance by reducing the rate of spending growth over the medium term. For more information, please visit <http://www.budget.gc.ca/2010/home-accueil-eng.html>.

In response to (c), the Bank of Canada does not publish revenue or expenditure projections for the federal government.

In response to (d), budget 2010, see page 12, was clear: "The Government will not raise taxes and will not cut major transfers to persons and other levels of government."

Routine Proceedings

In response to (e), budget 2009 announced a review of corporate assets. No decisions have been taken to date and no savings booked. A systematic review of corporate assets is a normal part of good governance and contributes to the ongoing reallocation of financial resources from low to high priorities in order to maximize economic benefits to taxpayers.

Question No. 594—Ms. Megan Leslie:

With regard to the government's new excise duty tobacco tax stamp, which was designed and produced by the Canadian Bank Note Company and SICPA Product Security SA and implementation of which was mandated to the government in early 2010: (a) when will tobacco manufacturers be required to implement the new tobacco tax stamp on their products; (b) how much money has the government spent, since 2005 to present, to develop and implement the new tax stamping system; and (c) what are the reasons for the delay in implementing this initiative, which was first identified as a priority by the Canada Revenue Agency in 2005?

Hon. Keith Ashfield (Minister of National Revenue, Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), on July 12, 2010, Bill C-9, the Jobs and Economics Growth Act, received royal assent. This act contained the legislative amendments required to the Excise Act 2001 to implement a new stamping regime for tobacco products. Legislative amendments included a transitional period between the implementation date and March 31, 2011, during which time tobacco products may be stamped in compliance with the current stamping regime or with the new excise stamp in compliance with the new stamping regime for tobacco products.

As of September 1, 2010, the new excise stamp can be applied to tobacco products destined for the Canadian duty-paid market.

Effective April 1, 2011, all domestically manufactured tobacco products entered into the Canadian duty paid market or imported tobacco products released under the Customs Act for entry into the duty paid market must be stamped with the new excise stamp.

In response to (b), from 2005 to November 30, 2010, \$1,283,099 was spent on developing and implementing the Tobacco Stamping Regime.

In response to (c), since 2005, in order to facilitate the implementation of the tobacco stamping regime and reduce the costs to industry, the CRA has carried out extensive consultations with various stakeholders including tobacco product manufacturers, Health Canada, provincial and territorial governments, enforcement bodies such as the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Canada Border Services Agency and other interested parties.

In July 2007, the CRA conducted a competitive procurement process that resulted in the award of a contract to design, produce and distribute a tobacco stamp incorporating overt and covert security features. The contract was awarded in January 2008. Once prototype stamps were available from the stamp producer, a new round of consultations were commenced to assist industry with the acquisition of stamp application equipment and testing.

Subsequently, the CRA continued to work closely with the Department of Finance to develop the required legislative and regulatory amendments that would implement the new stamping regime. In September 2009, the Minister of National Revenue released proposals to amend the Stamping and Marking of Tobacco

Products Regulations to support the proposed legislative amendments. These amendments were part of Bill C-9 that was tabled in Parliament on March 4, 2010. Bill C-9 received royal assent on July 12, 2010.

The implementation date of the new stamping regime, as set out in the legislative amendments, was September 1, 2010.

Question No. 601—Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:

With respect to the government's commitment on June 10, 2009, to help fishers in the Atlantic lobster industry: (a) how much funding was spent in 2009; (b) how much has been spent to date; and (c) what are the government's plans for the remainder of the \$65 million?

Hon. Gail Shea (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), in 2009 \$65 million of funding was earmarked for two programs: the short term transitional measures, STTM, lobster program, as well as the Atlantic lobster sustainability measures, ALSM, program.

Some \$15 million was earmarked for the STTM lobster program which began September 22, 2009. By the end of 2009, approximately \$7.1 million was spent.

Some \$50 million was earmarked for the ALSM. No ALSM funds were spent in 2009.

In response to (b), the STTM program concluded March 31, 2010.

Of this, \$1 million was spent on operation and management costs of the program, \$8.6 million was spent on grants, and \$5.4 million of unspent funding was reported at year end as lapsed funding.

Unspent funding was a result of fewer than expected lobster licence holders qualifying under the STTM due to higher revenues from lobster fishing than anticipated.

Some \$6 million in funding proposals have been approved to date under ALSM and released in 2010. Additional funding proposals are under review.

In response to (c), it is the \$50 million ALSM program which is in effect until March 31, 2014.

Question No. 609—Hon. Gurbax Malhi:

With respect to Employment Insurance claims made by residents in the constituency of Bramalea—Gore—Malton (named Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale from 2000 to 2004): (a) how many claims have been made since October 1993, (i) in total, (ii) broken down by month; (b) what is the percentage of claims that have been approved since January 2008, (i) in total, (ii) broken down by month; and (c) what has been the average period of time taken to process the claims made since January 2008, (i) in total, (ii) broken down by month?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, detailed employment insurance, EI, information specifically related to the constituency of Bramalea—Gore—Malton is unavailable as data of the type requested is not maintained at the constituency level.

Question No. 618—**Mr. Glenn Thibeault:**

With regard to government health promotion programs: (a) what departments, agencies and commissions are responsible for administration programs promoting a healthy style of living; (b) what are the names of the programs that promote a healthy style of living; (c) how much funding was spent by departments and agencies on programs promoting a healthy style of living from fiscal year 2006-2007 to date; (d) how much funding was allocated to each province for the administration of programs promoting a healthy style of living; and (e) were programs promoting a healthy style of living audited during the past three fiscal years and, if any, what were the recommendations?

Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), Health Canada is responsible for or contributes to the administration of a number of programs promoting a healthy style of living.

In response to (b), the names of the programs are: Aboriginal Diabetes Initiative;

Maternal and Child Health Program;

Canada Pre-Natal Nutrition Program;

Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder Program;

Aboriginal Head Start On Reserve Program;

Brighter Futures & Building Healthy Communities;

National Native Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program;

National Youth Solvent Abuse Program;

National Aboriginal Youth Suicide Prevention Strategy;

National Tuberculosis Program;

Immunization Program;

HIV/AIDS-Blood-Borne and Sexually Transmitted Infection (HIV/AIDS-BBSTI) Program;

Children's Oral Health Initiative Program;

First Nations Environmental Contaminants Program;

Northern Contaminants Program;

Chemical Safety of Traditional Food Program;

First Nations Food, Nutrition and Environment Study;

Environmental Health Guide Program;

Eating Well with Canada's Food Guide;

Nutrition Labelling Education;

School Health;

Knowledge Transfer;

Drug Strategy Community Initiatives Fund;

Drug Treatment Funding Program;

Contribution program in support of the Federal Tobacco Control Strategy.

In response to (c), Health Canada provided \$1,516,900,000 in funding from fiscal year 2006-07 to date.

In response to (d), no funding is allocated to provinces or territories for the administration of programs.

In response to (e), an internal review of the national native alcohol and drug abuse program was conducted in 2008.

The recommendations from this audit were as follows:

1. Ensure that formal risk assessments of the program continue.
2. Ensure that roles and responsibilities of the partners are clear.
3. Develop a formal performance measurement process.
4. Revisit the National Native Addictions Information Management System, NNAIMS, project and consider revalidating business requirements.
5. Consolidate documentation tracking key activities, and strengthen the quality of activity reporting from funds recipients.

All Audit Accountability Bureau internal audits are posted on the Health Canada website at: <http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/ahc-asc/performance/audit-verif/index-eng.php>

No audits have been completed on other programs during the past three fiscal years.

In response to (a), the Public Health Agency of Canada, PHAC, is responsible for the administration of programs promoting a healthy style of living.

In response to (b), PHAC has two programs that promote a healthy style of living. The healthy living fund is a program that makes strategic investments to address the conditions that lead to unhealthy eating, physical activity and unhealthy weights. The innovation strategy, IS, focuses on innovation in population health interventions to reduce health inequalities.

In response to (c), PHAC provided \$36,091,502 in funding from fiscal year 2006-07 to date.

In response to (d), no funding is allocated to provinces and territories for the administration of programs.

In response to (e), there was an audit conducted on the Health Promotion Programs, HPP, including the Healthy Living Fund and Innovation Strategy between December 2008 and July 2009.

Routine Proceedings

The audit found that many areas of the health promotion programs are adequately managed. These include the existence of results-based management accountability frameworks, program guidelines and standard operating procedures for the management of grants and contributions projects. Training provided to PHAC officers was also found to be appropriate.

The audit concluded that some areas of the health promotion programs require management attention. In September 2009, a comprehensive management response was implemented to address the processes for: setting program and funding priorities, renewing and amending ongoing projects, adequately overseeing and monitoring projects to minimize financial and non-financial risk to the agency, and measuring and reporting the results of the projects and programs that PHAC supports through its contributions. Good progress has been made on the implementation plan with the majority of deliverables completed or on track.

For more information, see the following link http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/about_apropos/audit/hpp-pps-eng.php.

Question No. 619—Mr. Glenn Thibeault:

With regard to expenses for the Canada Millennium Scholarship Foundation from January 1, 2006 to October 1, 2010: (a) what was the total global amount spent on hospitality expenses on an annual basis from fiscal year 2006-2007 to date; (b) since fiscal year 2006-2007 to date, on an annual basis, how much was spent on (i) leasing expenses, (ii) catering services, (iii) restaurants, (iv) coffee and beverages, (v) bottled water, (vi) petty cash; (c) how much was paid to third parties to provide hospitality services since fiscal year 2006-2007 to date, on an annual basis; (d) what companies received sole source contracts to provide hospitality services since fiscal year 2006-2007 to date, on an annual basis; and (e) since fiscal year 2006-2007 to date, on an annual basis, how much was spent on (i) limousine services, (ii) private air service, (iii) executive class commercial air service, (iv) economy class commercial air service, (v) car rentals?

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Human Resources and Skills Development provides a nil response to this question.

Human Resources and Skills Development Canada does not have access to information necessary to respond to the above noted question. However, information associated with the question may be found in the CMSF annual report. Additional information including financial records for the CMSF may be found at Library and Archives Canada.

Question No. 625—Mrs. Carol Hughes:

With regard to the Canada Revenue Agency (CRA): (a) what is the estimated amount of income tax Canada was unable to recover during fiscal years 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10 because of aggressive tax planning, use of offshore accounts or tax evasion by both Canadian individuals and corporations; (b) what proportion of the tax gaps in the aforementioned years is attributable to individuals and what proportion is attributable to corporations; (c) does CRA collect information and data tracking the international tax gap on an ongoing basis; and (d) how much tax revenue has the CRA recovered since 2007 as a result of revelations concerning the activities of Canadians using offshore accounts and services offered by the Swiss bank UBS, which helps Canadians avoid taxes?

Hon. Keith Ashfield (Minister of National Revenue, Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), the Canada Revenue Agency, CRA, cannot provide the information in the manner requested. The CRA does not maintain estimates either

of tax gap per se or the amount of revenue that perhaps has not been declared by individuals.

In response to (b), the CRA does not maintain estimates either of tax gap or the amount of revenue that perhaps has not been declared by individuals. Therefore, the CRA cannot provide information in the manner requested.

In response to (c), the CRA does not collect information and data tracking the international tax gap.

In response to (d), since 2007, the CRA has recovered \$8.54 million in tax revenue as a result of information received, regarding the accounts and services in question.

Question No. 629—Hon. Larry Bagnell:

What are all oil spills that have been reported to the federal government from federal agencies, provincial, territorial or municipal governments in the last four years and what did the federal or territorial governments do in response to each notification?

Hon. Gail Shea (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, the number of oil spills that have been reported to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canadian Coast Guard, by federal agencies and provincial, territorial or municipal governments in the last four years in Canada is 969.

In 584 cases, an assessment was conducted by Canadian Coast Guard personnel and it was determined that no cleanup was required.

In 385 cases, Canadian Coast Guard determined that an operational cleanup was required as follows:

Cleanup operations were conducted by the polluter in 227 incidents (in these cases, the polluter assumed management of the response to the incident and the Canadian Coast Guard monitored their response operations);

Cleanup operations were conducted by the Canadian Coast Guard in 132 incidents (in these cases, the polluter was either unwilling, unable or was unknown and, as such, the Canadian Coast Guard managed the response), and;

The Canadian Coast Guard provided assistance as a resource agency in 26 incidents, CCG provided personnel and/or equipment to another lead agency for incidents that did not originate from a ship or were mystery-source.

Please note that an operational cleanup could include minor operations, such as placing sorbent pads and boom onto the water to recover sheens of oil, to more significant operations including the deployment of skimmers, containment boom and other pollution response equipment to recover more significant amounts of oil.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 630—Hon. Larry Bagnell:**

With regard to the centralization of government pensions and the information services of the pensions provided by the territorial governments: (a) what are all consultations and the outcomes for these consultations with each of the territorial governments and their unions; (b) are there any backlogs in client services as a result of this centralization and, if so, (i) what is the length of the backlogs, (ii) what is the number of people affected by the backlogs, (iii) what are the plans to resolve the backlogs; and (c) how will the efficient, quick level of service previously provided by the local territorial government be replicated for the territorial employees?

Hon. Rona Ambrose (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the centralization of federal government pensions and the information services of the pensions provided by the territorial governments. With regard to (a), the communications strategy for this initiative was initially designed to advise stakeholders of the change in service delivery as each service was centralized to the pension centre. Consultations occurred with departments, crowns and territorial governments, and concept-of-operations sessions were provided for each service; focus group meetings detailing and updating work procedures and the new pension tools; on-site visits to each of the territorial governments by the director, pension services directorate and the director general, compensation services; and the dissemination of information at quarterly Stakeholder steering committee meetings. Feedback and consultations were integral to ensuring an outcome in which stakeholders are well informed and will have a successful transition to the new pension services delivery model.

With regard to (b), the backlogs in client services are not as a result of centralization. The pension centre in Shediac, New Brunswick did not experience backlogs in areas which had centralized services. Backlogs in other services occurred because experienced staff had been deployed to the pension modernization project and in part from issues that arose with the new work load management tool, and as a result of an increased work effort due to working with old and new processes simultaneously.

With regard to (c), the implementation of a new service model and systems over the long term will ensure that all members receive timely, consistent service, and advice directly from the pension experts located in the public service pension centre.

Question No. 633—Hon. John McCallum:

With regard to the government's planned announcement of a new North American security perimeter, for every meeting between Ministers, their staff or senior bureaucrats related to the announcement: (a) what was the date of the meeting; (b) who participated (i) from the Canadian side, (ii) from the American side; and (c) what was the location of the meeting?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while our officials have regular and ongoing meetings with colleagues from other North American countries, at this time there is no plan to announce a security perimeter for North America.

Question No. 636—Ms. Ruby Dhalla:

With respect to meetings requested with the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration since January 2008: (a) what are the names of the organizations, lobbyists and individuals who made such requests; and (b) which meetings were attended by the Minister, including the date, time, and locations, and if the Minister did not attend the meeting, which government representatives, ministerial or department staff attended the meeting on the Minister's behalf?

Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism, CPC): Mr. Speaker, insofar as Citizenship and

Immigration Canada, CIC, is concerned, in response to (a), in preparing this response, CIC is only considering requests for meetings made from outside the federal government.

Similarly, requests to meet the minister by applicants who write to CIC about their cases have not been included in this number as the department does not track these requests and identifying them is not feasible in the timeframe provided for this response.

Requests to meet with the Minister are received through a number of sources, including but not limited to: departmental correspondence, the minister's official departmental email, and the Citizenship and Immigration Canada website, www.cic.gc.ca. Citizenship and Immigration Canada keeps records of meeting requests if they are received directly via mail or through the minister's official departmental email. Meetings requests received via other channels are sometimes noted in other departmental records. CIC was able to identify a total of 182 outside requests to meet the minister from January 1, 2008, to December 10, 2010, based on the departmental records listed above.

CIC is unable to provide the requested information about these meetings as it is not possible within the timeframe provided for the response for the department to exercise the due diligence that is required to divulge this information in view of a number of considerations, including complying with the Privacy Act.

In response to (b), information about meetings the minister, government representatives or ministerial staff may have attended as a result of the requests identified in section (a) is not under the control of the department.

Information about meetings that may have been attended by departmental officials as a result of the requests identified in section (a) cannot be identified in the timeframe provided for this response.

It should be noted that lobbyists must file a monthly communication report with the Registry of Lobbyists for each oral and arranged communication they have with a designated public office holder, such as a minister. For more information, please consult the Web site of the Office of the Commissioner of Lobbying of Canada: <http://www.ocl-cal.gc.ca>.

Question No. 641—Mr. Todd Russell:

With respect to Employment Insurance Account Projections from the Fall Economic Update of 2010: (a) what are the projected revenues and expenses of the Employment Insurance Account for the period of January 1 to December 31 in the years 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014; (b) do projected Employment Insurance Account expenses in 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014 include funding for Employment Insurance Pilot Projects; and (c) which Employment Insurance Pilot Projects are included in the projection of Employment Insurance Account expenses in 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Jim Flaherty (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), projected employment insurance, EI, revenues and expenses, presented on a fiscal year basis, April 1 to March 31, from 2010-11 to 2015-16 were included in the 2010 Update of Economic and Fiscal Projections, pages 35 and 37. For more information, please visit <http://www.fin.gc.ca/ec2010/pdf/efp-pef-eng.pdf>.

In response to (b), the aforementioned projection included funding for pilot projects.

In response to (c), all pilot projects announced on or before October 12, 2010 were included.

Question No. 646—**Mr. Bruce Hyer:**

With regard to payments issued by Public Works and Government Services Canada in fiscal years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011: (a) how much was issued for payment on behalf of Infrastructure Canada for signage, in each fiscal year; and (b) what cheques were issued for payments on behalf of Infrastructure Canada for signage, in each fiscal year, including the date each cheque was issued?

Hon. Rona Ambrose (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Public Works and Government Services Canada has records of payments issued on behalf of Infrastructure Canada in fiscal years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 to date, but these records do not separately track items such as signage. Public Works and Government Services Canada is therefore unable to provide the information requested.

Question No. 647—**Mr. Marc Garneau:**

With regard to the government's compensation for the victims of Agent Orange testing in 1966, will the government be delivering all of the promised \$96 million to the victims of Agent Orange or their families, in cases where the victims are deceased?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Blackburn (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada is committed to spending the allocated funds. On December 22, 2010, the Government of Canada announced an extension of the agent orange ex gratia payment, changing some of the criteria and deadlines to ensure people affected by agent orange can qualify for the ex gratia payment.

Question No. 648—**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:**

With regard to 438 Helicopter Squadron, based in Saint-Hubert: (a) does the government intend to close the Squadron's facilities in Saint-Hubert and, if so, (i) why does the government intend to close these facilities, (ii) for what date is the closure scheduled; (b) does the government intend to eliminate the Squadron and, if so, (i) why does the government intend to eliminate the Squadron, (ii) for what date is the elimination scheduled; (c) does the government intend to move the Squadron and, if so, (i) where does the government intend to move the Squadron, (ii) for what date is the move scheduled; (d) how many jobs for commissioned or other members of the Forces, reservists and civilians will be directly affected by the closure or move; and (e) for each of the categories of employment mentioned in (d), (i) how many positions will be abolished, (ii) how many positions will be moved?

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, 438 tactical helicopter squadron is an air reserve squadron located at Saint-Hubert, Quebec, and is equipped with CH-146 Griffon helicopters. The squadron is tasked with supporting the various militia elements in the region.

The Canadian Forces are currently undergoing a defence force structure review, as well as developing plans for the introduction of the new CH-147F Chinook medium-heavy lift helicopter. While it is not yet known if this will result in any adjustments to the overall

distribution of existing tactical helicopters and personnel, the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces have no current plans to close 438 tactical helicopter squadron.

Question No. 649—**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:**

With regard to the process for obtaining a pilot's license: (a) what documents must students submit to Transport Canada authorities to obtain a license; (b) is it essential for students to provide the originals of their pilot training record and pilot logbook to obtain a license; (c) is it possible for students to obtain their license without providing the originals of these two documents; (d) is it possible for students to have obtained a license without possessing the originals of these two documents; and (e) if students are found to have attempted to mislead the Department, can it withdraw the license in question?

Hon. Chuck Strahl (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by Transport Canada that with regard to (a), the Canadian Aviation Regulations, CAR, outline the general requirements for students wishing to obtain a Canadian aviation pilot permit or license. The requirements include providing proof of citizenship, age, aviation language proficiency and a passport style self photograph.

Applicants must include proof of having met the medical fitness, knowledge, experience and skill requirements when applying for a specific pilot permit or license.

Proof of experience includes the submission of the pilot training record, PTR, and the pilot's personal logbook. The pilot training record must outline all of the training exercises completed. The logbook is reviewed by Transport Canada to verify the completion of the minimum experience required for the issue of the specific permit or license applied for.

With regard to (b), it is essential that the original pilot training record and pilot's personal logbook be submitted with the application. Transport Canada retains the pilot training record, which remains on the applicant's personnel licensing file.

The applicant's pilot logbook is reviewed by Transport Canada to verify that the experience requirements have been met. Once the experience requirements have been verified, the logbook is returned to the applicant.

With regard to (c), the pilot training record and pilot's personal logbook are required to be submitted with the application in order to obtain a pilot permit or license. There are provisions in the Canadian Aviation Regulations for the loss of a pilot logbook due to extenuating circumstances.

With regard to (d), original documents are required to be submitted with the application in order to obtain a pilot permit or license. There are provisions in the Canadian Aviation Regulations for the loss of a pilot logbook due to extenuating circumstances.

With regard to (e), if all of the requirements for a permit or license have not been met the document will not be issued. If a permit or license has been issued in error Transport Canada can recall the document.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 651—Hon. Navdeep Bains:**

With regard to the government's ownership positions in independent companies that are not considered Crown Corporations: (a) in which publicly traded companies did the government own stock as of December 14, 2010; (b) what was the level of ownership, both in number of stocks and the percentage of ownership; (c) when were these ownership positions taken; (d) does the government appoint any directors of these companies and, if so, who are they; (e) when were these positions taken; (f) in which private companies does the government own stakes; (g) what percentages of these companies does the government own; (h) who are the other owners of these companies; (i) does the government appoint members to these companies' boards of directors and, if so, who are they; (j) when were these positions taken; and (k) when were these positions for both public and private companies last reviewed?

Hon. Stockwell Day (President of the Treasury Board and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Board Secretariat, TBS, could not provide all of the information requested within the timeframe allotted to respond to this question. Where possible, TBS has provided the information that it could reasonably retrieve and provide.

With regard to (a), TBS produces an annual report to parliament, ARTP, on crown corporations and other corporate interests of Canada. Most of the Government of Canada's corporate interests in commercial and not-for-profit corporations are held through crown corporations, not directly by the Government of Canada.

The president's "Annual Report to Parliament on Crown Corporations and Other Corporate Interests of Canada 2010" is available online at <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/reports-rapports/cc-se/2010/cc-se06-eng.asp>. The most recent ARTP was tabled in Parliament on December 8, 2010, and is current as at July 31, 2010. Given the scope and complexity of the government's corporate interests, it would likely take several months to update this report comprehensively up to December 14, 2010.

A detailed listing of crown corporations' corporate holdings and their share ownerships are listed in section 2.4 of the ARTP, found at <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/reports-rapports/cc-se/2010/cc-se06-eng.asp>. Additional information on corporate holdings may be available on individual crown corporation websites.

TBS reports on the percentage of Government of Canada ownership within a range; that is, government ownership of 100%, 50% to 99% and less than 50%). It does not compile information or report on the number of shares owned.

The information in the ARTP concerning subsidiaries/associates may not contain all of the indirectly held corporate holdings or all those held at less than 100%. For certain corporations, details on their specific holdings and investments may be considered commercially sensitive information, which cannot be made public. Consequently, TBS does not compile or report on this information. For example, among those organizations in which the Government of Canada has an interest, the Canada pension plan investment board and the public sector pension investment board are the primary holders of shares in private companies and do not disclose what they own due to commercial sensitivities.

With regard to (b), please refer to the response for part (a).

With regard to (c), the ARTP does not indicate when ownership positions were taken, unless the position was new or changed within the reporting year.

Additional information on corporate holdings may be available on individual Crown corporation websites, including recently approved annual reports and corporate plan summaries.

With regard to (d), crown corporations can have a role in appointing directors to companies in which they have an interest. TBS does not have information on which crown corporations have exercised such a role and with which independent companies this role was exercised. This may be available through individual crown corporation websites.

With regard to (e), please refer to the response for part (d).

With regard to (f), please refer to the response for part (a).

With regard to (g), please refer to the response for part (a).

With regard to (h) (i) and (j), TBS does not have information about the other owners of these companies. Additional information on corporate holdings may be available on individual crown corporation websites, including recently approved annual reports and corporate plan summaries.

With regard to (k), crown corporations can have a role in appointing directors to companies in which they have an interest. TBS does not have information on which crown corporations have exercised such a role and with which independent companies this role was exercised.

Question No. 654—Mrs. Michelle Simson:

With regard to the firearms training program for Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) officers: (a) what is the increase in pay or benefits as a result of an officer being certified to carry a firearm; and (b) how much has been spent to date on (i) transportation of trainees to training facilities, (ii) accommodation for trainees and trainers, (iii) employee benefits plans?

Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Canada Border Services Agency that with regard to (a), there have been no increases in pay or benefits as a result of arming.

With regard to (b), to date, \$143M has been spent during the first four years of implementing the arming program: (i) On average, the travel related cost and meals per learner attending a duty firearm course is approximately \$4,000; (ii) The CBSA cannot isolate specific costs related to accommodations; (iii) There have been no changes to employee benefits or allowances as a result of arming.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 656—Mrs. Michelle Simson:**

With regard to the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT): (a) how important is the use of specific language in letters, speeches and interventions at multilateral meetings and in documents produced by DFAIT in determining Canada's foreign policy; (b) is there a difference between the terms (i) "Child Soldiers" and "children in armed conflicts", (ii) "International Humanitarian Law" and "International Law", (iii) "gender equality" and "equality between men and women", (iv) "impunity for sexual violence" and "prevents sexual violence"; (c) has the Minister of Foreign Affairs or his office been requesting regular changes to wording in foreign policy documents; (d) what was discussed by DFAIT officials at a meeting regarding this issue held on May 21, 2009 in USS' boardroom A8-211 from 11:00 to 12:00; (e) was a coordinated departmental plan arranged at this meeting or future meetings about language at DFAIT; and (f) were any further meetings arranged to discuss language changes and, if so, how many meetings, who attended these meetings and what was decided at these meetings?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, since DFAIT is one department, the responses for the Minister of International Trade and the Minister of Foreign Affairs are the same.

With regard to (a), where language used in letters, speeches and interventions is reflective of Canada's international legal obligations, efforts are made to ensure that such language is consistent with terms of art used in relevant instruments, or that are meaningful for and understood by Canada's international partners. Official statements, interventions or other public foreign policy documents should, as much as possible, be drafted in such a manner as to allow Canadians and international partners to fully understand the government's policies and priorities.

With regard to (b)(i), "Child soldier" is an undefined term in international law. The optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict, a treaty that Canada has ratified, does not use the term. While the protocol does not prevent states parties from recruiting persons under the age of 18 years into their armed forces, it does provide that states parties must ensure that members of their armed forces who have not attained the age of 18 years do not take a direct part in hostilities. It also prohibits armed groups, as distinct from armed forces of a state, from recruiting or using in hostilities persons under the age of 18. The term "children in armed conflict", which is used in the protocol, offers a clearer reference to international law than "child soldier". Canada's use of the term "children in armed conflict" reflects the fact that the UN and the international community often use this term to capture a number of grave violations against children in situations of conflict, including the recruitment and use of children as soldiers, grave sexual violence against children, abduction of children and the denial of humanitarian access for children. Moreover, the "Principles and Guidelines on Children associated with Armed Forces or Armed Groups", which Canada has endorsed, do not use the term "child soldier"; (ii) International law is, very generally speaking, the law that governs the conduct between states and certain other actors. International humanitarian law, also known as the "law of war" or the "law of armed conflict", is part of international law. International humanitarian law is a set of rules which seek, for humanitarian reasons, to limit the effects of armed conflict. It protects persons who are not or are no longer participating in the hostilities and restricts the means and methods of warfare; (iii) In multilateral forum like the United Nations, the term "gender equality" is used interchangeably with "equality between men and women". For example, the Beijing Declaration, from the fourth World Conference on Women, Action

for Equality, Development and Peace in 1995, uses the language of "gender equality" and the Beijing Platform for Action refers to "equality between men and women". In the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, equality of or between men and women, or equality of the rights of men and women, is used throughout the text; (iv) The phrase "prevents sexual violence" addresses the general need to prevent future acts. The phrase "impunity for sexual violence" addresses the need to ensure that perpetrators of sexual violence are held accountable for their actions, thereby helping to deter others from perpetrating similar acts in the future. When calling for effective measures to address sexual violence, Canada uses language that includes both general prevention and, more specifically, the need to bring perpetrators to justice as one element of prevention;

With regard to (c), it is common practice for any government, through the Minister of Foreign Affairs or his office, to provide input into official statements, interventions or other foreign policy documents drafted by officials to ensure that public positions reflect the Government's policies and priorities.

With regard to (d), in the normal course of government business, any number of meetings are held which ensure that the terminology used by the government in public statements, letters, speeches and other similar documents remains consistent with the government's international obligations and policy objectives.

With regard to (e), no.

With regard to (f), please see response to question (d).

Question No. 658—Hon. Judy Sgro:

With regard to Canada Emission Reduction Incentives Agency, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

Hon. Peter Kent (Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Act creating the Canada Emission Reduction Incentives Agency came into force on October 3, 2005 in accordance with the Order in Council number PC 2005-1716. The Agency however is not operational.

Question No. 675—Ms. Judy Foote:

With regard to The Heritage Canada Foundation, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Stockwell Day (President of the Treasury Board and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Heritage Canada Foundation is a national, non-governmental, not-for-profit charity. The Heritage Canada Foundation is an independent body. The government cannot provide a response to this question. The Heritage Canada Foundation should be contacted directly for more information.

Question No. 684—**Mrs. Bonnie Crombie:**

With regard to Canada Revenue Agency, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Keith Ashfield (Minister of National Revenue, Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the above-noted question, what follows is the response from the Canada Revenue Agency, CRA. Unless otherwise indicated, please note that the CRA's answer includes information from January 1, 2009 to December 14, 2010 that is, the date of the question.

The CRA's charities partnership and outreach program is designed to provide funding to registered charities and non-profit organizations serving the charitable sector in Canada to develop and deliver innovative compliance-related education and training to other registered charities. The CRA also administers two statutory payment programs, which are reported as statutory grants: the children's special allowances and the energy cost benefit.

With regard to the charities partnership and outreach program, CPOP, the CRA's CPOP is designed to provide funding to registered charities and non-profit organizations serving the charitable sector in Canada to develop and deliver innovative compliance-related education and training to other registered charities

From January 1, 2009, up to and including the current fiscal year, to December 14, 2010, i.e., the date of the question, the CRA has awarded one contribution agreement for \$19,156 directly under the auspices of the CPOP to the Public Legal Education Association of Saskatchewan, PLEA.

With regard to the children's special allowances, CSA, CSA payments are governed by the Children's Special Allowances Act which provides that this allowance be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund. Subsection 10(1) of the Children's Special Allowances Act would prevent the Canada Revenue Agency, CRA from disclosing the monetary value of individual payments. In some cases, the CRA can respond with aggregate data. However, in situations where the sample size of the aggregate is too small such that a recipient could be directly or indirectly identified, in keeping with subsection 10(1), aggregate data is not released.

From January 1, 2009, up to and including the current fiscal year, to December 31, 2010, the CRA did not issue any payments under \$25,000.

With regard to the energy cost benefit, ECB, the Energy Costs Assistance Measures Act provides that ECB payments be paid out of the consolidated revenue fund to families who were eligible for the national child benefit supplement in January 2006. Subsection 241(1) of the Income Tax Act prevents the CRA from disclosing the monetary value of individual payments. In some cases, the CRA can respond with aggregate data. However, in situations where the

sample size of the aggregate is too small such that a recipient could be directly or indirectly identified, in keeping with the subsection 241(1) of the Income Tax Act, aggregate data is not released.

As the data can only be provided in aggregate, and for the aforementioned reasons, the CRA is unable to confirm whether specific payments under \$25,000 have been made.

Unlike the CSA, the ECB was a one time tax exempt payment announced in October 2005. The ECB payment to recipients began in January 2006.

Question No. 685—**Mrs. Bonnie Crombie:**

With regard to the National Energy Board, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Christian Paradis (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, from January 1, 2009 to the present, the National Energy Board did not award any grants or contributions under \$25,000

Question No. 686—**Ms. Joyce Murray:**

With regard to the Canada Emission Reduction Incentives Agency, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Peter Kent (Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the act creating the Canada Emission Reduction Incentives Agency came into force on October 3, 2005 in accordance with the order in council number PC 2005-1716. The agency however is not operational.

Question No. 687—**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj:**

With regard to the Canadian Development Investment Corporation, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Jim Flaherty (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker the Canada Development Investment Corporation has not awarded any grants and contributions under \$25,000 from January 1, 2009 to present.

Question No. 688—**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj:**

With regard to Export Development Canada, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, EDC did not award any grants or contributions under \$25,000 from January 1, 2009 to present.

Question No. 689—**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj:**

With regard to Statistics Canada, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Statistics Canada did not award any grants and contributions under \$25,000 from January 1, 2009, to the present.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 690—Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj:**

With regard to the Canadian Tourism Commission, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Tourism Commission does not award grants and contributions.

Question No. 691—Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia:

With regard to the Privy Council Office, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Mr. Pierre Poilievre (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Privy Council Office awarded no grants or contributions under \$25,000 from January 1, 2009 to the present.

Question No. 694—Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia:

With regard to the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Rob Merrifield (Minister of State (Transport), CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority does not award grants and contributions.

Question No. 695—Mr. Scott Simms:

With regard to the Canada Border Services Agency, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the CBSA does not have grants and contributions programs.

Question No. 697—Mr. Scott Simms:

With regard to the Copyright Board of Canada, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Copyright Board Canada is an administrative tribunal that establishes copyright royalties. The Board did not award any grants or contributions under \$25,000 from January 1, 2009, to the present.

Question No. 700—Mr. Paul Szabo:

With regard to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Christian Paradis (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, from January 1, 2009 to the present, the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission awarded the following grants and contributions under \$25,000:

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
Laurentian Chapter of the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry
McMaster University
Canadian Nuclear Law Organization
Canadian Nuclear Society
Canadian Radiation Protection Association
International Commission on Radiation Units

Women in Nuclear Canada

International Commission on Radiation Units

Canadian Radiation Protection Association

American Statistical Association

Canadian Nuclear Society

University Network of Excellence in Nuclear Engineering

Canadian Organization of Medical Physicists

Question No. 701—Mr. Paul Szabo:

With regard to the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Gerry Ritz (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, CPC): Mr. Speaker, From January 1, 2009 to December 14, 2010, the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) awarded two contributions under \$25,000. Each contribution, awarded to the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine of the University of Montreal under the Federal Assistance Program, was for \$15,000.

¹ The Federal Assistance Program (FAP) is the CFIA's contribution program, the terms and conditions for which were approved by the Treasury Board in June 2006. The objective of the FAP is to provide financial support to projects that are consistent with the Agency's mandate in terms of food safety, animal health and plant protection. In addition to the FAP's terms and conditions, the management of the contribution agreements must abide by the Government's Transfer Payment Policy.

Question No. 702—Mr. Paul Szabo:

With regard to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Christian Paradis (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, from January 1, 2009 to the present, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited awarded the following grants and contributions under \$25,000:

Inter-Collegiate Business Competition
McMaster University
Shanghai Jiao Tong University
McMaster University
Deep River Science Academy
Xi'an Jiaotong University
Deep River Science Academy
Shanghai Jiao Tong University
University of Guelph
Manitoba Science Academy
Manitoba Science Academy
New Brunswick Community College

Routine Proceedings

Tsinghua University—Beijing

Canadian Standards Association

Fisheries and Oceans Canada

University of Ontario Institute of Technology

McMaster University

University of Ontario Institute of Technology

Energy Council of Canada

McMaster University

Question No. 703—Mr. Paul Szabo:

With regard to the Veterans Review and Appeal Board, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Blackburn (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, there were no grants or contributions awarded by the Veterans Review and Appeal Board.

Question No. 705—Ms. Libby Davies:

With regard to the number of telecommunication cell towers in Canada: (a) how many towers are below 15 metres in height and, of those, how many towers are situated in the riding of Vancouver East; and (b) how many towers are above 15 metres in height and of those, how many towers are situated in the riding of Vancouver East?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Industry Canada's interests relate primarily to managing the radio frequency spectrum, a limited resource. For this reason, no differentiation is made as to whether an antenna is, for example, located on a tower, on top of a building or is using an existing structure such as a water tower or hydro pole. Accordingly, our database does not record the number of towers as distinct from antennas. On November 22, 2010, the Minister of Industry announced that there will be a review of the tower-sharing policy as part of Canada's digital economy strategy. As part of this review, Industry Canada expects to be able to approximate the number of cellphone towers throughout Canada by late spring.

Question No. 706—Ms. Libby Davies:

What are the court cases concerning telecommunication cell towers, either ongoing or concluded, of which the government is aware and what follow-up has been undertaken by the government as a result of these court cases?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, there have been only two recent cases where the Minister of Industry was or has been made a party to a court case involving telecommunications towers. Canada (Minister of Industry) v. Thomson, [2004] F.C. 265; Levine v. Canada (Minister of Industry), [2009] F.C. 1297. In both cases, the courts have affirmed decisions made by the Minister of Industry on antenna and antenna tower siting in accordance with his mandate under the Radiocommunication Act. For example, see Telus Communications Inc. v. Toronto (City) (2007), 84 O.R. (3d) 656.

There are a few recent cases that involve the siting of antennas where the minister is not a party but has been served with a notice of questions involving constitutional jurisdiction. Some of these cases are ongoing, but the ones that have been decided have affirmed that

antenna tower siting and the exercise of other functions under the Radiocommunication Act are properly matters of federal jurisdiction.

Therefore, Industry Canada has not been required to take follow-up action as a result of any court cases. However, Industry Canada commissioned an extensive study and review of its antenna siting policy and procedures and revised them three years ago in order to respond to comments and concerns from the public, local-land use authorities and radiocommunication operators.

Question No. 708—Mr. Alan Tonks:

With regard to the Minister of State (Democratic Reform), what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. John Baird (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Office of the Minister of State for Democratic Reform and the exempt staff are subject to proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Privy Council Office website at the following link: www.pco-bcp.gc.ca.

Question No. 709—Mr. Alan Tonks:

With regard to the Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification), what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Lynne Yelich (Minister of State (Western Economic Diversification), CPC): Mr. Speaker, details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister of State and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009 are located on the proactive disclosure page of Western Diversification's website <http://www.wd.gc.ca/eng/113.asp>.

Question No. 710—Mr. Alan Tonks:

With regard to the Minister of State (Transport), what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Rob Merrifield (Minister of State (Transport), CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of State for Transport and the exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details for their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on Transport Canada website at the following link: http://www.wapps2.tc.gc.ca/Corp-Serv-Gen/2/DTH-DVA/disclosure/emp_list.asp.

Question No. 711—Mr. Alan Tonks:

With regard to the Minister of Health, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Leona Aglukkaq (Minister of Health, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health and minister's exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on Health Canada's website at the following link: www.hc-sc.gc.ca.

Question No. 712—Mr. Justin Trudeau:

With regard to the Minister of Labour, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Lisa Raitt (Minister of Labour, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister of labour and the exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the departmental website at the following link: www.labour.gc.ca.

Question No. 715—**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:**

With regard to the Minister of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Denis Lebel (Minister of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec), CPC): Mr. Speaker, travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister of State and all exempt staff of the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec are made public through proactive disclosure on the agency's website, www.dec-ced.gc.ca.

Question No. 716—**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:**

With regard to the Minister of State of Foreign Affairs (Americas), what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of State of Foreign Affairs (Americas) and his exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade website at the following link: <http://www.international.gc.ca>.

Question No. 717—**Mr. Rodger Cuzner:**

With regard to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians and Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. John Duncan (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians and Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-Status Indians and Minister of the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency and the exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Indian Affairs and Northern Development website at the following link: www.ainc-inac.gc.ca.

Question No. 718—**Mr. Gerard Kennedy:**

With regard to the Minister of State (Seniors), what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of State for Seniors and her exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Department of Human Resources and Skills Development website at the following link: www.rhdcc-hrsdc.gc.ca.

Question No. 719—**Mr. Gerard Kennedy:**

With regard to the Minister of State and Chief Government Whip, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. John Baird (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Office of the Minister of State and Chief Government Whip and the exempt staff are subject to proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Privy Council Office website at the following link: www.pco-bcp.gc.ca.

Question No. 720—**Mr. Gerard Kennedy:**

With regard to the Minister of State (Sport), what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of State for Sport and the exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on Canadian Heritage website at the following link: <http://www.pch.gc.ca>.

Question No. 721—**Mr. Gerard Kennedy:**

With regard to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Gail Shea (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and all exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on Fisheries and Oceans' website at the following link: www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca.

Question No. 722—**Mr. Robert Oliphant:**

With regard to the Minister of State (Small Business and Tourism), what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of State for Small Business and Tourism and the exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on Industry Canada's website at the following link: www.ic.gc.ca.

Question No. 723—**Mr. Robert Oliphant:**

With regard to the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. James Moore (Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, CPC): Mr. Speaker the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages and the exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on Canadian Heritage website at the following link: <http://www.pch.gc.ca>.

Question No. 724—**Hon. Joseph Volpe:**

With regard to the Minister of International Cooperation, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Bev Oda (Minister of International Cooperation, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of International Cooperation and her exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Canadian International Development Agency's website at the following link: www.acdi-cida.gc.ca.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 726—Hon. Joseph Volpe:**

With regard to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and his exempt staff are subject to proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade website at the following link: <http://www.international.gc.ca>.

Question No. 727—Hon. Joseph Volpe:

With regard to the Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Diane Finley (Minister of Human Resources and Skills Development, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources and Skills development and her exempt staff are subject to proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Human Resources and Skills Development website at the following link: www.rhdcc-hrsdc.gc.ca.

Question No. 728—Hon. Denis Coderre:

With regard to the Minister of Natural Resources, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Christian Paradis (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Natural Resources Canada, NRCan, and all exempt staff are subject to proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on NRCan's website at the following link: <http://www2.nrcan-mcan.gc.ca/dthe-cfva/index-eng.cfm>.

Question No. 729—Hon. Denis Coderre:

With regard to the Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Jason Kenney (Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Multiculturalism, CPC): Mr. Speaker, insofar as Citizenship and Immigration Canada, CIC, is concerned, this information is not maintained within CIC's financial system. It was extracted from information disclosed in the proactive disclosure for travel and hospitality expenses, which is manually compiled from individual travel and hospitality claims at the end of each reporting quarter. Information about these travel and hospitality expenses can be found on our proactive disclosure website: <http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/disclosure/expenses/menu-minister.asp>.

Question No. 730—Hon. Denis Coderre:

With regard to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Gerry Ritz (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Minister for the Canadian Wheat Board and all exempt staff are subject to proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada's website at the following link: <http://www.agr.gc.ca>.

Question No. 731—Hon. Denis Coderre:

With regard to the Minister of International Trade, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Peter Van Loan (Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of International Trade and his exempt staff are subject to proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the website at the following link: <http://www.international.gc.ca>.

Question No. 732—Mr. Derek Lee:

With regard to the Minister of Finance, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Jim Flaherty (Minister of Finance, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance and the exempt staff are subject to proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Department of Finance's website at the following link: www.fin.gc.ca.

Question No. 733—Mr. Derek Lee:

With regard to the Minister of Industry, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and the exempt staff are subject to proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on Industry Canada's website at the following link: www.ic.gc.ca.

Question No. 734—Mr. Derek Lee:

With regard to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister for La Francophonie, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. John Baird (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Office of the President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister for La Francophonie and the exempt staff are subject to proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Privy Council Office website at the following link: www.pco-bcp.gc.ca.

Question No. 735—Mr. Bernard Patry:

With regard to the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice and the exempt staff are subject to proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Department of Justice website at the following link: www.justice.gc.ca.

Question No. 736—Mr. Bernard Patry:

With regard to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture), what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Routine Proceedings

Hon. Jean-Pierre Blackburn (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Veterans Affairs and the exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Veterans Affairs Canada website at the following link: www.vac-acc.gc.ca.

Question No. 737—**Mr. Bernard Patry:**

With regard to the Leader of the Government in the Senate, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. John Baird (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Office of the Leader of the Government in the Senate and the exempt staff are subject to proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Privy Council Office website at the following link: www.pco-bcp.gc.ca.

Question No. 738—**Mr. Bernard Patry:**

With regard to the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Chuck Strahl (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities and their exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details for their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on Transport Canada website at the following link: http://www.wapps2.tc.gc.ca/Corp-Serv-Gen/2/DTH-DVA/disclosure/emp_list.asp.

Question No. 739—**Hon. Wayne Easter:**

With regard to the Prime Minister, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. John Baird (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Office of the Prime Minister and the exempt staff are subject to proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Privy Council Office website at the following link: www.pco-bcp.gc.ca.

Question No. 742—**Ms. Olivia Chow:**

With respect to the G20 Summit ex gratia payments: (a) how many applicants for compensation have there been; (b) what was the total amount claimed; (c) what was the average amount of each claim; (d) how much has been paid to claimants; and (e) what was the total amount budgeted to pay out these claims?

Hon. Lawrence Cannon (Minister of Foreign Affairs, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), there have been 371 applicants for compensation.

In response to (b), the total amount claimed is \$10,656,869.54.

In response to (c), given the numerous differences between the categories of claims and characteristics of each, it would be imprudent to calculate an average based solely on the number of claims and their total value. The impact of the extraordinary security measures varies widely based on the typical revenue of the claimants, the location of the business and the length of time they were affected.

In response to (d), the auditors are in the process of identifying ineligible claims. As of January 5, 2011, 44 claims have been deemed inadmissible.

In response to (e), because it was impossible to forecast the degree to which the extraordinary financial measures put in place for the G20 would cause adverse financial consequences, the Summits Management Office maintained a sufficient budgetary margin to compensate eligible claimants.

Question No. 745—**Hon. Wayne Easter:**

With regard to the government's involvement in the issue of the electricity transmission system to Prince Edward Island: (a) from January 31, 2006, to December 1, 2010, on what dates were there communications between the Government of Canada and the Government of Prince Edward Island concerning an upgrade to or the replacement of the electricity transmission system between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick; (b) has the Government of Canada made a commitment to the Government of Prince Edward Island concerning funding related to the electricity transmission system and, if so, what is the specific amount of funding committed and on what date was that commitment communicated to the Government of Prince Edward Island; and (c) has the Government of Canada entered into any discussions with the Government of Prince Edward Island, the Government of New Brunswick or Maritime Electric on the issue of the electricity transmission system to Prince Edward Island and, if so, (i) on what dates did those communications take place, (ii) what were the agenda items for each of those communications, (iii) what were the results of those discussions?

Hon. Chuck Strahl (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), Infrastructure Canada has ongoing and regular discussions with regard to a large number of potential priorities for funding under federal infrastructure funds with all provinces and territories, including the Government of Prince Edward Island. As such, it is not possible to provide with any degree of accuracy information pertaining to the dates on which communication took place between the Government of Canada and the Government of Prince Edward Island on a given issue within the 45-day period in which this response would be due.

In response to (b), as of December 14, 2010, Infrastructure Canada has made no commitment to the Government of Prince Edward Island concerning funding related to the electricity transmission system to date.

In response to (c), Infrastructure Canada has ongoing and regular discussions with regard to a large number of potential priorities for funding under federal infrastructure funds with all provinces and territories, including the Government of Prince Edward Island and the Government of New Brunswick. Consistent with section 14 of the Access to Information Act, Infrastructure Canada does not disclose any records that contain information the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to be injurious to the conduct by the Government of Canada of federal-provincial affairs, including, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, any such information on federal-provincial consultations or deliberations or on strategy or tactics adopted or to be adopted by the Government of Canada relating to the conduct of federal-provincial affairs.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 748—Mr. Yvon Godin:**

With respect to the firing range in Tracadie-Sheila, New Brunswick: (a) does the Minister of National Defence intend to respect section 10 of the federal-provincial land transfer agreement regarding the former range signed in March 1997 and, where applicable, when will he enforce it, in light of the discovery of unexploded explosive ordnance (UXO) in 2006 and 2008 at a depth of 20 cm in the north section of ammunition-related area (ARA) 7 and UXO in 2006 at a depth of 5 cm in ARA 8, which violates section 7 of the agreement stipulating that ARAs 7 and 8 must be cleared of all UXO to a depth of 45 cm; (b) when will the Department of National Defence undertake additional clearance work in the section of ARA 4 where UXO and pieces of ammunition were discovered in 2007 in order to comply with section 5 of the agreement stipulating that ARA 4 can be safely used without restriction with respect to the possible presence of UXO; (c) when will the Department of National Defence carry out the necessary clearance work to a depth of 45 cm in ARA 1 in order to make this area safe and comply with the terms of the agreement on page C-1 stipulating that no UXO should be present following surface clearance work, in light of UXO discovered in ARA 1 in 2006 and 2007; (d) when will the Department of National Defence carry out clearance work of ARA 10 where munitions debris has been buried and where UXO has been discovered so as to protect the environment and prevent possible groundwater contamination in this area; and (e) what is the status of the initiative confirmed by the Department of National Defence to carry out additional clearance work of UXO between 2011 and 2015?

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of National Defence, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), the Minister of National Defence intends to respect the federal-provincial memorandum of agreement on land transfer. A residual risk audit of the former Tracadie range has been conducted, and site characterization survey work is ongoing. The requirement for additional risk mitigation measures in some areas of the Tracadie range and to address unexploded explosive ordnance, UXO, management at the former Tracadie range is under way. The Department of National Defence, DND, and the Province of New Brunswick are consulting to define an appropriate action plan. Meetings for this purpose between DND and the Province of New Brunswick have taken place and efforts for collaboration on UXO management are ongoing.

In response to (b), as stated in the memorandum of agreement, MoA, a DND-contracted survey has been conducted of the Tracadie range by qualified professionals. ARA 4 borders other ARAs where the potential for UXO was high. Consequently, the discovery of UXO in ARA 4 is most likely from UXO associated with other ranges that border this area. The requirement for further UXO investigation along border areas has been identified, and additional clearance work may be undertaken as a result.

In response to (c), section 7 of the MoA states that UXO clearance in ARA 1 is to be surface-level only. However, DND remains open to consultation with the Province of New Brunswick in order to explore whether further clearance work in ARA 1 is required, based on the terms of agreement of the MoA.

In response to (d), section 7 of the MoA states that UXO clearance in ARA is to be surface-level only. Schedule C stipulates that buried UXO will remain in ARA 10. Consequently and based upon the terms of agreement of the MoA, there is no requirement to carry out clearance work in ARA 10. In addition, environmental characterization results within the Tracadie range obtained by the Defence Research Establishment—Valcartier demonstrated that there was no risk associated with the presence of energetic materials residues, neither in the soils nor in the biomass present on the range.

In response to (e), the initiative to carry out additional clearance work and risk mitigation measures in specific areas of the former

Tracadie range is ongoing. Consultation between DND and the Province of New Brunswick is taking place in order to enable the development of project requirements and options analysis for further UXO clearance at the Tracadie range.

Question No. 770—Hon. Ken Dryden:

With respect to Veterans Affairs Canada (VAC) and the recommendation made by the Special Needs Advisory Group (SNAG) in 2006 that VAC employ veterans: (a) what action has VAC taken to implement the recommendation; (b) what response, if any, has been provided to SNAG on the recommendation; and (c) what analysis has been completed by VAC on the feasibility of this recommendation and what were the conclusions or findings?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Blackburn (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture), CPC): Mr. Speaker, with respect to (a), in response to the Special Needs Advisory Group's 2006 recommendation to employ veterans, Veterans Affairs Canada developed a recruitment plan which included a recommendation that Veterans Affairs Canada follow the lead of the Department of National Defence and open up internal competitions to Canadian Forces members. As a result of the new veterans charter, the Public Service Employment Act, PSEA, was amended to permit serving Canadian Forces members to apply on internal advertised processes, where they are identified as eligible in the area of selection. Additionally, Veterans Affairs Canada's area of selection policy specifically addresses the inclusion of Canadian Forces members.

The Department of National Defence and Veterans Affairs Canada work in partnership to assist Canadian Forces members to transition to civilian employment by making them more aware of, and ensuring that they have access to, public service employment opportunities. Through outreach in veteran publications and veteran-related websites, Veterans Affairs Canada provides information on career services and programs, including priority job placement. Medically released veterans are also informed of their priority access eligibility during their Veterans Affairs Canada transition interview at the time of their release from the Canadian Forces. Veterans Affairs Canada's new veterans charter provides two programs that support veterans in reintegrating into the civilian workplace. The rehabilitation program provides vocational rehabilitation to medically releasing veterans, while the career transition program provides career transition services to those who are voluntarily releasing.

Veterans Affairs Canada's integrated business and human resources plan includes a priority that recruitment efforts will target Canadian Forces members and that Veterans Affairs Canada will "continue outreach to modern-day veterans for employment opportunities".

Routine Proceedings

Medically released Canadian Forces members have been eligible for priority job appointments within the public service since December 31, 2005. The Public Service Commission has analyzed the number of referrals of medically released Canadian Forces members to individual departments, along with the number of subsequent appointments by these departments. The Public Service Commission advises that Veterans Affairs Canada rated highest of all government departments in terms of appointment in ratio to the number of referrals, 13.2% of those referred being appointed to positions. Since December 31, 2005, Veterans Affairs Canada has hired 19 medically released Canadian Forces members who were eligible for priority job appointments within the public service.

In response to (b), Veterans Affairs Canada provided a response to the Special Needs Advisory Group on this recommendation at the Special Needs Advisory Group's meeting on June 14-15, 2006, that recruitment would be reviewed and that Veterans Affairs Canada would follow the lead of the Department of National Defence in opening areas of selection to Canadian Forces members.

In response to (c), as stated above, work has been undertaken regarding the recommendations. As recently as November 2010, the human resources division at Veterans Affairs Canada launched a voluntary survey of staff in order to gather information on the number of staff who are active or former members of the Canadian Forces. As of December 31, 2010, 100 Veterans Affairs Canada employees have self-identified. This number may include medical-release priority appointments noted above.

Additionally, the human resources division conducted a second part to the survey whereby Veterans Affairs Canada employees were asked to self-identify, on a voluntary basis, if they have family members with Canadian Forces experience. As of December 31, 2010, this survey has had 86 positive responses.

Question No. 771—Hon. Ken Dryden:

With regard to the President of the Treasury Board and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Stockwell Day (President of the Treasury Board, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway and the exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the Treasury Board Secretariat website at the following link: <http://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca>.

Question No. 772—Hon. Ken Dryden:

With regard to the Minister of Public Safety, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Vic Toews (Minister of Public Safety, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Safety and his exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on Public Safety's website at the following link: http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/abt/trv_hsp/index-eng.aspx.

Question No. 773—Hon. Michael Ignatieff:

With respect to meetings of Cabinet, on which dates has Cabinet met since January 1, 2010?

Mr. Bob Dechert (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Privy Council Office responds that the dates of cabinet or cabinet committee meetings are considered cabinet confidences under section 69 of the Access to Information Act, unless they have been made public. Two meetings of the cabinet committee on priorities and planning during 2010 meet this criterion: February 3, 2010, and August 3, 2010.

Question No. 777—Hon. Ralph Goodale:

With respect to the government's decision on the matter of the takeover bid by BHP Billiton for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan: (a) what was the nature and extent of the public opinion research conducted by any part of the government, or by any other entity and made available to the government either directly or indirectly on this specific takeover or, more broadly, on the application of the Canada Investment Act; (b) what was the total cost; (c) what company, companies or government departments were contracted or engaged in association with this research; and (d) what were the results of this research?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Industry Canada did not conduct any public opinion research with respect to the takeover bid by BHP Billiton for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan.

Question No. 778—Hon. Ralph Goodale:

With respect to media reports surrounding the government's decision on the matter of the takeover bid by BHP Billiton for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan: (a) has the government launched or completed an investigation into the leak to former Postmedia columnist Don Martin which led to a column published in the National Post on November 1, 2010 entitled "Investment Canada gives Potash takeover tentative nod" that cited multiple government sources and, if so, (i) what was the nature of the documents or information obtained by Mr. Martin, (ii) did the government find a breach of Cabinet confidence occurred, (iii) who was responsible, (iv) which government departments were involved; and (b) regardless of whether the government conducted an appropriate investigation, what remedial action has been taken to protect against leaks of this nature in the future?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with respect to media reports surrounding the government's decision on the matter of the takeover bid by BHP Billiton for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, under the Investment Canada Act, the minister responsible has the sole authority to determine the likely net benefit of a reviewable investment. Except for the investor, only the minister can make a net benefit determination public.

Under the act, the minister may appoint a director of investments to advise and assist him in exercising his powers and performing his duties.

Section 19 of the act outlines the responsibilities of the director of investments in assisting the minister in determining the likely net benefit of a reviewable investment:

Routine Proceedings

19. The Director shall refer to the Minister [...] any of the following material received by the Director in the course of the review of an investment [...]: (a) the information contained in the application filed under section 17 and any other information submitted by the applicant; (b) any information submitted to the Director by the person or entity from whom or which control of the Canadian business is being or has been acquired; (c) any written undertakings to Her Majesty in right of Canada given by the applicant; and (d) any representations submitted to the Director by a province that is likely to be significantly affected by the investment.

Question No. 779—**Hon. Ralph Goodale:**

With respect to media reports surrounding the government's decision on the matter of the takeover bid by BHP Billiton for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan: (a) has the government launched or conducted a review of its procedures and practices with respect to the distribution of sensitive information affecting decisions under the Investment Canada Act following the multiple leaks emanating from within the government and, if so, (i) what was the nature of the documents or information that prematurely made their way into the public sphere, (ii) did the government find a breach of Cabinet confidence occurred, (iii) who was responsible, (iv) which government departments were involved; and (b) regardless of whether the government conducted an appropriate investigation, what remedial action has been taken to protect against leaks of this nature in the future?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with respect to media reports surrounding the government's decision on the matter of the takeover bid by BHP Billiton for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan: Under the Investment Canada Act, the minister responsible has the sole authority to determine the likely net benefit of a reviewable investment. Except for the investor, only the minister can make a net benefit determination public.

Under the act, the minister may appoint a director of investments to advise and assist him in exercising his powers and performing his duties.

Section 19 of the act outlines the responsibilities of the director of investments in assisting the minister in determining the likely net benefit of a reviewable investment:

19. The Director shall refer to the Minister [...] any of the following material received by the Director in the course of the review of an investment [...]: (a) the information contained in the application filed under section 17 and any other information submitted by the applicant; (b) any information submitted to the Director by the person or entity from whom or which control of the Canadian business is being or has been acquired; (c) any written undertakings to Her Majesty in right of Canada given by the applicant; and (d) any representations submitted to the Director by a province that is likely to be significantly affected by the investment.

Question No. 780—**Hon. Ralph Goodale:**

With respect to the government's decision on the matter of the takeover bid by BHP Billiton for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan: (a) what was the nature of the exchange of information, including documentation, between the government and (i) the province of Saskatchewan, (ii) the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, (iii) BHP Billiton and its subsidiaries, (iv) any other corporation, entity or individual, (v) other governments, (vi) Parliament, (vii) the public; and (b) what were the government's communications plan or plans and contingency communications plan or plans with respect to the approval or rejection of the takeover under the Investment Canada Act; and (c) what was the government's definition of "net benefit" in this particular case and how is it different from the tests applied to previous bids by (i) Vale Inco, (ii) US Steel, (iii) Nortel?

Hon. Tony Clement (Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the government's decision on the matter of the takeover bid by BHP Billiton for the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan, in response to: (a)(i) under the Investment Canada Act, ICA, the minister may consult with any province that is significantly affected by a proposed investment. However, the information exchanged during the consultation process is confidential under section 36 of the ICA.

In response to (a)(ii), the relationship under the ICA is established between the investor and the minister. Information provided during the review process is obtained from the investor and is confidential under section 36 of the ICA.

In response to (a)(iii), the information obtained from the investor during the review process is confidential under section 36 of the ICA unless it is made public by the investor or the investor consents to its publication.

In response to (a)(iv), where third-party representations are received that could have an adverse bearing on the determination of net benefit, investors are advised of the substance of those representations and given an opportunity to respond to them.

The representations made by a third party are confidential under section 36 of the ICA.

In response to (a)(v), under the ICA, the Minister may consult with any province that is significantly affected by a proposed investment. However, the information exchanged during the consultation process is confidential under section 36 of the ICA.

In response to (a)(vi), on November 29, 2010, there was a late show motion number 121 in the House of Commons. Also, on November 4, 2010, there was an opposition day motion by the NDP regarding BHP's proposed acquisition of Potash Corp. The Hansard text for these debates can be seen at: www.parl.gc.ca.

In response to (a)(vii), on November 3, 2010, the Minister of Industry issued a statement indicating that, at that time, he was not satisfied that the proposed transaction was likely to be of net benefit to Canada. On November 14, 2010, the minister issued a statement confirming that BHP Billiton had withdrawn its application for review, thereby terminating the review process.

In response to (b), as mentioned above, the Minister of Industry issued statements on November 3 and 14, 2010, regarding the proposed investment. BHP withdrew its application for review, thereby terminating the review process under the ICA. No decision was therefore made by the minister.

Routine Proceedings

In response to (c), section 20 of the Investment Canada Act lists the factors that the minister must consider in a net benefit determination. They are as follows: (a) the effect of the investment on the level and nature of economic activity in Canada, including, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the effect on employment, on resource processing, on the utilization of parts, components and services produced in Canada and on exports from Canada; (b) the degree and significance of participation by Canadians in the Canadian business or new Canadian business and in any industry or industries in Canada of which the Canadian business or new Canadian business forms or would form a part; (c) the effect of the investment on productivity, industrial efficiency, technological development, product innovation and product variety in Canada; (d) the effect of the investment on competition within any industry or industries in Canada; (e) the compatibility of the investment with national industrial, economic and cultural policies, taking into consideration industrial, economic and cultural policy objectives enunciated by the government or legislature of any province likely to be significantly affected by the investment; and (f) the contribution of the investment to Canada's ability to compete in world markets.

In reaching a decision on net benefit, the minister considers the investor's plans and undertakings, other representations from affected provinces, and the results of the consultations held with other federal government departments.

The minister's net benefit determination is made on a case-by-case basis, based on the merits of each investment proposal.

Question No. 782—**Mrs. Lise Zarac:**

With regard to the Minister of National Defence, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of National Defence, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence and his exempt staff are subject to the proactive disclosure. The details of their travel and hospitality expenses can be seen on the National Defence website at the following link: www.forces.gc.ca.

Question No. 783—**Hon. Scott Brison:**

With regard to the Department of Natural Resources: (a) for how many nuclear licenses is the department responsible; (b) since 2006, have any nuclear licenses expired and, if so, where are the sites that are no longer licensed?

Hon. Christian Paradis (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), the Department of Natural Resources is responsible for four nuclear substance licenses under the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

In response to (b), since 2006, the Department of Natural Resources has had no nuclear licence expire without renewal.

Question No. 784—**Hon. Scott Brison:**

Why did the government not spend the total amount of \$200 million allocated to the Green Infrastructure Fund and what were the remaining funds used for?

Hon. Chuck Strahl (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, unlike most other economic action plan measures, the green infrastructure fund, GIF, was announced in budget 2009 as a five-year \$1 billion fund supporting infrastructure projects that promote cleaner air, reduced greenhouse

gas emissions and cleaner water. As of December 14, 2010, 18 green infrastructure projects had been announced for a total of \$627 million in federal funding.

While \$200 million was provided for fiscal year 2009-10 through the 2009 Budget Implementation Act, as reported in the sixth Report to Canadians, not all of this funding was expended. It is important to remember that the GIF is a five year program that funds largescale strategic projects of national or regional significance. Such projects typically require longer lead time for the planning, engineering and development stages which results in a smaller amount of expenditures in the early years and larger expenditures during the construction phase in the later years.

Moreover, as is the case for all programs managed by Infrastructure Canada, the federal government is a funding partner and does not manage or control the construction of infrastructure projects. Federal funding for approved projects flows as construction proceeds and costs are incurred. Once the federal government has approved the project, the pace at which a project gets built and funds flow depends on claims submitted by the proponent and is not within the federal government's control. Once receipts are submitted, the federal government pays all eligible costs within 30 days.

It is important to note that any unspent funding under the GIF was not lost, but reprofiled to future years to meet the cash flow requirement of our partners.

Question No. 786—**Hon. Scott Brison:**

With regard to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and the Northside Civic Centre Project in North Sydney, Nova Scotia, the Pictou County Wellness Centre in Pictou County, Nova Scotia, the Central Nova Scotia Civic Centre in Truro, Nova Scotia, the Sydney Harbour Dredging Project in Sydney, Nova Scotia and the Halifax Harbour Dredging Project south of Point Pleasant Park in Halifax, Nova Scotia: (a) what are the federal funding sources for each project; (b) what is the amount of funding for each project; and (c) what are the programs for each project?

Hon. Keith Ashfield (Minister of National Revenue, Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway, CPC): Mr. Speaker, insofar as the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, ACOA, is concerned, with regard to each of the projects listed, in response to (a), federal funding for the Northside Civic Centre in North Sydney, Nova Scotia comes from Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, ECBC, and ACOA.

In response to (b) the funding amounts are \$3 million from ECBC and \$1 million from ACOA.

In response to (c), the funding programs are ECBC's Cape Breton growth fund and ACOA's innovative communities fund.

Pictou County Wellness Centre in Pictou County, Nova Scotia has not received ACOA funding.

Routine Proceedings

The Central Nova Scotia Civic Centre in Truro, Nova Scotia has not received ACOA funding.

With respect to the Sydney Harbour Dredging Project in Sydney, Nova Scotia, in response to (a), federal funding for this project comes from Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, ECBC.

In response to (b), the federal funding amount is \$19 million.

In response to (c), the funding program is ECBC's commercial development program. The Halifax harbour dredging project south of Point Pleasant Park in Halifax, Nova Scotia has not received ACOA funding.

Question No. 787—Mr. Brian Murphy:

With regards to the government's outlined plans for coal regulations, tail-pipe emissions and carbon capture storage technology as a way to reduce Canadian greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), what other initiatives does the government plan to implement in order to reach its own target of reducing GHG emissions to 17% below 2005 levels and bring Canada closer to the internationally agreed-upon target of 6% below 1990 levels?

Hon. Peter Kent (Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government supports an approach to climate change that achieves real environmental and economic benefits for all Canadians. Given the level of integration of the North American economy, it makes absolutely no sense to proceed without aligning a range of principles, policies, regulations and standards.

Some of the steps we have taken as we continue to pursue work towards our target on a sector by sector basis have been noted.

We are moving forward with common North American standards for regulating greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector, which accounts for about approximately one-quarter of greenhouse gas emissions in Canada.

Environment Canada published the final Passenger Automobile and Light Truck Greenhouse Gas Emission Regulations in the Canada Gazette part II on October 13, 2010. These will establish progressively tighter GHG emission standards for new cars and light trucks over the 2011 to 2016 model years in alignment with U.S. national standards. We are also working on common North American standards for the post-2016 period.

We are also developing regulations to reduce GHG emissions from heavy-duty vehicles; a consultation document outlining the proposed elements of the future regulations was released on October 25, 2010. Regulations will be developed in 2011 for the 2014 and later model years.

The government is also working through its renewable fuels strategy to promote expanded production and use of cleaner, renewable fuels such as ethanol and biodiesel. As part of this strategy, the government has finalized regulations requiring an average renewable fuel content 5% in gasoline which came into effect on December 15, 2010. We have also announced that we will implement a requirement for 2% renewable content in diesel fuel and heating oil, subject to successful demonstration of technical feasibility.

The Government is taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from coal-fired electricity generation through the applica-

tion of a stringent performance standard. The gradual phase-out of old and dirty coal-units is expected to have a significant impact on reducing emissions from the electricity generation sector and improve air quality for all Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

Going forward, we will continue to develop and implement climate change policies that make sense for Canada and that are aligned, as appropriate, with those of our largest trading partner, the United States.

Budget 2010 includes new measures totaling \$190 million to support a cleaner, more sustainable environment and to help meet Canada's climate change objectives. It includes new measures to promote energy investments and help develop and deploy clean energy technologies such as the \$100 million Investments in forest industry transformation initiative which supports the development, commercialization and implementation of advanced clean energy technologies in the forestry sector. This builds on the important investments made under Canada's economic action plan, which includes \$795 million over five years for the clean energy fund in support of clean energy research and \$1 billion over five years for the green infrastructure fund for priorities such as green energy generation and transmission, carbon transmissions and storage infrastructure. To further ambitious national goals, the government has also invested \$4.2 billion in the eco-energy initiatives to encourage the production of cleaner energy and cleaner fuels and increase energy efficiency.

Furthermore, we are taking important steps through the Canada-U.S. clean energy dialogue, CED. The CED has led to enhanced collaboration on the development of clean energy science and technology to reduce greenhouse gases and combat climate change. In addition, as announced at the North American leaders' summit in August 2009, Canada, the U.S. and Mexico are collaborating in a wide range of areas to advance real action on climate change and clean energy, in North America and internationally.

Question No. 789—Mr. Brian Murphy:

With regard to the Nuclear Legacy Liabilities Program, how much has the Department of Natural Resources spent in each fiscal year since 2006?

Hon. Christian Paradis (Minister of Natural Resources, CPC): Mr. Speaker, please see Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd.'s annual financial reports available at www.eacl-aecl.ca, for this information.

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 790—Mr. Brian Murphy:**

With respect to the Department of National Defence, for every project over 5 million dollars which received money from the department in the last 5 years and which involved incurred or currently foreseen cost overruns of 15% or more relative to the initial predictions: (a) what is the name of that project and details on its nature; (b) what is the history of cost predictions for that project, including (i) dates of predictions reviews and amounts of the predictions, (ii) itemized predictions on the costs of different subparts of that project; (c) what are the reasons for the cost overruns; (d) what are the dates at which Ministers or their close staff were informed of the cost predictions described in part (b), what was the name of the Minister or staffer that received the information and what is a description of the actions taken, if any, by the Minister in reaction to that information; and (e) what is, in percentage (compared with the initial prediction), and in dollars, the final incurred value or the currently expected value of the cost overrun?

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of National Defence, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, in response to (a), the Department of National Defence, DND, has conducted a search of the capability initiative database and has identified 1,260 projects over the last five years valued at over \$5 million that would have to be analyzed to determine if they meet the criteria of having involved, incurred or currently foreseen cost overruns of 15% or more relative to the initial predictions. Due to the volume of projects and the complexities outlined below, a response cannot be provided in the time available. It is estimated that to provide a full response to all parts of this question would require 40 hours per project—1,260 projects x 40 hours = 50,400 hours—given that much of the information resides with individuals involved in these projects and not in a central database.

In response to (b), costs for projects are formally identified at three phases: identification, preliminary project approval and effective project approval. As such, estimates for initial costs may vary depending on the stage of the projects. This creates difficulty in establishing an initial prediction of the cost of a project depending on what stage of the project is considered. The assumption is that the initial cost prediction would be based on the identification stage of the project as identified in a synopsis sheet. However, some strictly financial submissions do not have a synopsis sheet and the initial cost prediction would have to be determined in some other fashion. As initial predictions of project costs are not always identified at the same stage of the process, it would be difficult to establish a common procedure to identify a baseline initial prediction from which to judge whether or not a project has costs overruns of 15% or more.

Itemized predictions of cost overruns are not stored in the capability initiative database and would require a search by the project director and management of each affected project as well as by financial and corporate services staff. This process would require an intensive manual search for each of the 1,260 projects over \$5 million.

In response to (c), in many instances cost changes cannot be attributed to a single factor and may be a result of a complex combination of numerous factors including changes to economic models for inflation, contingency plans, changes to the scope of the project, currency exchange rates, the introduction of the HST and so on. Extensive research for each of the 1,260 projects would be required to produce an analysis pointing to the reasons for cost overruns for each project.

In response to (d), this type of information is not stored in any type of central database and would reside in numerous types of

documentation including, but not limited to, briefing notes, correspondence, email records and/or verbal conversations. An extremely detailed and time-consuming analysis would be required for each project to produce this information. As such, it is not likely that this information could be produced for all 1,260 projects.

In response to (e), this information could be provided only after the preceding analyses have been conducted.

Question No. 791—Hon. Geoff Regan:

With regard to lapsed funds from Environment Canada under Grants and Contributions 2009-2010 and the \$31 million in grants and contributions left over from 2009-2010, why has the Canadian Foundation for Climate and Atmospheric Sciences request for funding renewal been refused?

Hon. Peter Kent (Minister of the Environment, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada greatly appreciates the work that has been undertaken by the Canadian Foundation for Climate and Atmospheric Sciences, CFCAS. CFCAS was established in 2000 and has received \$110 million from the Government of Canada to support university-based climate and atmospheric research. CFCAS research projects and networks are currently scheduled to be completed in the coming months. In addition, the government granted CFCAS an extension to its mandate, which will allow its operations to continue through to March 2012.

The Government of Canada also invests in climate and atmospheric science through a number of other organizations and programs including the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, NSERC, the Canada Foundation for Innovation, the Canada Research Chairs Program and the Networks of Centres of Excellence Program. The Government of Canada recognizes that sound science leads to sound policy making and remains committed to supporting climate and atmospheric science in Canada. Within the context of the current fiscal environment, the role of these types of organizations in contributing to Canada's overall scientific capacity will be fully considered.

Question No. 806—Mr. Scott Andrews:

With regard to the Department of Transport and, more specifically, the 2007 risk assessment study conducted for the South Coast, including Placentia Bay: (a) how much funding was spent on the study, follow-up and the implementation of the recommendations; and (b) what are the terms of an agreement with Mr. Stan Tobin to conduct a review in Placentia Bay, including cost, scope of work and time frames?

Hon. Chuck Strahl (Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, CPC): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Department of Transport and, more specifically, the 2007 risk assessment study conducted for the south coast, including Placentia Bay, in response to (a), this project was initiated by the Canadian Coast Guard and thereafter transferred to Transport Canada, along with the Environmental Response Group, in 2003. Transport Canada managed the risk assessment in full partnership with Canadian Coast Guard. The following is a breakdown of funds spent by Transport Canada over the course of the study:

Routine Proceedings

Annual Spending in Dollars

2005-06—146,247

2006-07—94,170

2007-08—92,921

2008-09—85,295

2009-10—7,135

Total 425,768

546, 548, 549, 551, 552, 554, 555, 556, 557, 559, 560, 561, 564, 566, 567, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 576, 577, 578, 579, 581, 583, 584, 586, 587, 588, 589, 591, 593, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 602, 603, 605, 606, 607, 608, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 626, 627, 628, 631, 632, 634, 635, 637, 638, 639, 640, 642, 643, 644, 645, 650, 652, 653, 655, 657, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 676, 677, 678, 680, 681, 682, 683, 692, 693, 696, 698, 699, 704, 707, 713, 714, 725, 740, 741, 743, 744, 746, 747, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 774, 775, 776, 781, 785, 788, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, and finally Questions Nos. 813, 814, 815, 816, 817.

The only funding spent by Transport Canada on follow-up and implementation of the recommendations is that allotted to the contract with Mr. Stan Tobin to provide Placentia Bay with an emergency contact plan. See the response to (b) which follows. As of January 2, 2011, a total of \$9,270 has been released for this contract.

In response to (b), in light of the recent oil spill risk assessment for the south coast of Newfoundland, Mr. Tobin has been contracted by Transport Canada to review all existing emergency and environmental response plans developed by government and industry for the Placentia Bay area, and to produce a summary report that contains all pertinent contact information.

A sole-source contract was issued to the environmental consultant based on his extensive experience and unique and extensive knowledge of the Placentia Bay area and of Canada's marine oil spill preparedness and response regime. The sole-source method was chosen because it will allow the department to deliver an emergency contact plan to the Placentia Bay community without delay. Further, this will help keep costs to a minimum, as the time required to familiarize another consultant with the history and background of the regime and Placentia Bay area would be significant.

With respect to the cost, as this was a sole-source contract, it was awarded at the financial limitation of \$22,100, plus HST, and approved under the financial authority of the Director, Operations and Environmental Programs, Transport Canada Marine Safety.

With respect to the scope of work, Mr. Tobin is required to prepare a summary document of all of the applicable government and industry preparedness, response and contingency plans in place for the Placentia Bay area, with contact information for public use. Further, the document must identify the responsibility of governments that would be involved in an oil spill in the Placentia Bay area, as well as that of industry groups that would be directly involved, i. e., response organization or oil handling facility.

With respect to the time frame, the contract was awarded to Mr. Tobin on October 19, 2010, and will be completed by January 31, 2011.

* * *

[English]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if the following questions could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately: Questions Nos. 542, 543, 544,

Routine Proceedings

[Text]

Question No. 542—**Mr. Alex Atamanenko:**

With respect to the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food's (AAFC) Advance Payments Program (APP) and its Western Canadian administrators, for each fiscal year since 2006-2007, up to and including the current fiscal year: (a) what amount of funding did AAFC advance to each of the APP administrators and how much of that funding was (i) interest-free, (ii) interest bearing; (b) what are the names of the APP administrators with whom the Minister entered into Advance Guarantee Agreements (AGAs), identifying those administrators who complied with their AGAs; (c) when was the government first made aware of breaches of AGAs by APP administrators; (d) how and by whom was the information in (b) communicated to the administrators; (e) what are the names of all applicants who applied to fill positions as APP administrators but were declined, (i) what criteria informed each rejection, (ii) who collected and reviewed this criteria, (iii) by whom, when and how was the applicant notified of the rejection, (iv) by whom, when and how were existing APP administrators notified of the rejected application; (f) what activities has the government undertaken to address the accessibility of advances to producers; (g) what correspondence has the government received addressing the issue in (f), how was this information communicated and by whom; (h) what activities has the government undertaken to ensure producers receive all of the accrued interest from the holdback; (i) how much interest was claimed through the Claim for Reimbursement of Interest; (j) how much money has the government spent on information technologies for the APP's online system; (k) how much money has the government spent on resolving the problem of duplicate and triplicate APP Identification Numbers; (l) pursuant to section 12.6.2 of the APP Administrative Guidelines, how much interest was paid by each administrator to the Minister for (i) failure to reimburse the loan on the next business day following the day on which the administrator received payment, in whole or in part of those advances, (ii) failure to reimburse its liability within 15 business days following the day of learning of a producer defaulting; (m) how much money has the government spent on dealing with APP administrators who are past the allowable 45 days to submit the End of Production Period report; (n) for each administrator, what was the holdback percentage specified (i) in each AGA, (ii) on each producer application to an administrator; (o) if any of the correlated amounts in (n) differ, what was the justification given in each case for the difference; (p) what percentage of producers have all-perils insurance documentation; (q) what correspondence did AAFC receive from existing APP administrators with regard to proposed new APP administrators, how was this information communicated and by whom; (r) what steps has the government undertaken, when and by whom to ensure that (i) documentation of creditworthiness is included in producer files, (ii) producer and witness signatures are authentic and valid; (s) what amount of funds has been paid to the Receiver General for Canada for the interest AAFC has already paid on advances under \$100,000.00; (t) what amount of interest owed to the Receiver General for Canada is delinquent or past the allowable 45 business days of the End of Production Period; (u) which administrators are delinquent on the End of Production Period Reports and for how many Production Periods; (v) what steps has the government undertaken to rectify the "System Default" situation with the APP online system; (w) how much money from all government departments, aside from the APP funds, have the administrators received and from which programs; (x) when were AAFC audits of the administrators conducted and by whom; (y) when and how were the results of the audits in (x) communicated to the Minister; (z) what actions has the government undertaken to ensure that the APP is efficiently managed by AAFC; (aa) what specific criteria does the Minister of Agriculture apply when assessing organizations pursuant to (i) paragraph (2)(1)(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Programs Act, (ii) paragraph (2)(1)(c) of the Agricultural Marketing Programs Act; (bb) what steps does the Minister take to ensure that all applicants have been provided a transparent and equal opportunity to apply for and be considered for the designation as an administrator while assessing organizations as in (aa); (cc) what steps does the Minister take to ensure that APP administrators currently under contract have complied with the terms of the AGA; and (dd) what steps has the government taken to ensure that the Minister and AAFC do not enter into new AGAs with administrators that are in breach of a prior AGA?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 543—**Mr. Paul Dewar:**

With regard to the government's full-time equivalent (FTE) employees working and studying outside Canada, for each department, agency, board and commission, and for each year since 2006 to the present: (a) how many FTEs are working abroad; (b) how many FTEs are on a temporary assignment outside Canada; (c) how many FTEs are working outside Canada as volunteers; (d) how many FTEs have been

seconded to work overseas in international development organizations; (e) how many FTEs are studying outside Canada; and (f) how much money has been spent on training FTEs outside Canada?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 544—**Mr. Paul Dewar :**

With regard to Canada's operations in Afghanistan: (a) what is the cost of private security (i) in total, (ii) for every year since 2006 to the present; (b) for each year since 2006 to the present, what are the names of the private security firms hired by Canada, what is the value of each contract awarded to each company and what is the nature of the services provided under each contract; and (c) what rules and policies apply to the government's contracting practices with regard to the hiring of private security firms in Afghanistan?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 546—**Hon. John McCallum:**

With regard to every project approved under the Economic Action Plan that was subsequently rescoped: (a) where is the project located; (b) on what date was the project originally approved; (c) on what date was the project rescoped; (d) what changes were made to the project; (e) how much federal funding was allocated to the project (i) before it was rescoped, (ii) after it was rescoped; and (f) what was the rationale for rescoping the project?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 548—**Mr. Don Davies:**

With regard to the comments about foreign influence on Canadian politicians made by Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) Director Richard Fadden on CBC Television on June 22, 2010: (a) what are the policies of CSIS and the Department of Public Safety in cases where foreign influence over elected officials is suspected; (b) which provinces have Cabinet ministers involved in the accusations and who are the Cabinet ministers; (c) which municipalities are involved in the accusations and who are the municipal politicians involved; (d) has the government communicated with (i) the premiers of the provinces involved about the matters in (b), (ii) the mayors of the cities involved about the matters in (c); (e) have Canadian government representatives had conversations or discussions with or made representations to representatives of the government of China regarding Mr. Fadden's comments; (f) have Canadian government representatives had conversations or discussions with or made representations to representatives of foreign governments other than that of China regarding Mr. Fadden's comments; (g) what were the contents and results of any conversations or discussions with or representations to representatives of other foreign governments regarding Mr. Fadden's comments; and (h) since June 22, 2010, what steps has the government taken to address concerns raised about politicians under foreign influence?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 549—**Mr. Robert Oliphant:**

With respect to the Chinese head tax redress: (a) what is the total number of head tax certificates that were issued by the government; (b) how many applications for Chinese head tax redress were (i) received, (ii) accepted, (iii) rejected; (c) how many applications for Chinese head tax redress were received after the March 31, 2008 deadline; (d) under the Community Historical Recognition Program, how many applications relating to the Chinese head tax have been (i) received, (ii) accepted, (iii) rejected; (e) how much money has been awarded to applications under the Community Historical Recognition Program relating to the Chinese head tax; (f) under the National Historical Recognition Program, how many applications relating to the Chinese head tax have been (i) received, (ii) accepted, (iii) rejected; (g) how much money has been awarded to applications under the National Historical Recognition Program relating to the Chinese head tax; (h) what government grants have been given out for other projects related to the Chinese head tax not covered under the Community Historical Recognition Program and the National Historical Recognition Program, (i) what were these grants, (ii) when were they awarded, (iii) how much were they worth; and (i) with regard to the Chinese head tax redress and the grants as outlined in (d), (f), and (h), how much money has been spent on (i) promotional materials, (ii) advertising, (iii) celebrations and events, (iv) staff, (v) staff travel, (vi) meetings, (vii) any other spending?

Routine Proceedings

(Return tabled)

Question No. 551—**Ms. Irene Mathysen:**

With regard to all federal funding in the riding of London North Centre for fiscal years 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010: (a) how many projects received funding from a department or agency over this period; (b) what projects received funding from a department or agency over this period; and (c) what was the value of the projects that received funding from a department or agency over this period?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 552—**Ms. Irene Mathysen:**

With regard to all federal funding in the riding of London West for fiscal years 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010: (a) how many projects received funding from a department or agency over this period; (b) what projects received funding from a department or agency over this period; and (c) what was the value of the projects that received funding from a department or agency over this period?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 554—**Hon. Carolyn Bennett:**

With regard to the government's implementation of private Members' bills, what is a detailed description of the government's progress as concerns the implementation of each such bill that received Royal Assent during the 39th and 40th Parliaments?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 555—**Hon. Carolyn Bennett:**

With regard to citizen engagement, what is a detailed description of all such activities and consultations currently ongoing at all government departments, agencies and boards?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 556—**Hon. Carolyn Bennett:**

With regard to the government's plans to increase voter turnout in the next federal election, what measures does the government plan to take to encourage or facilitate: (a) youth voting; (b) overseas voting; (c) electronic voting; (d) voting in rural and remote regions; and (e) any other measures of similar intent?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 557—**Hon. Carolyn Bennett:**

With regard to the legislation governing the activities of Officers of Parliament, what are the details of any discussions held or research conducted by the government concerning revisions to legislation concerning: (a) the Access to Information Commissioner; (b) the Privacy Commissioner; (c) the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner; and (d) the Commissioner of Lobbying?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 559—**Mr. Alex Atamanenko:**

What is the total amount of government funding, since fiscal year 2006-2007 up to and including the current fiscal year, allocated within the constituency of British Columbia Southern Interior, specifying each department or agency, initiative and amount?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 560—**Hon. Bob Rae:**

With regard to the recent purchase of the F-35 stealth fighter jets: (a) what strategic studies have been conducted by either the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) or the Department of National Defence (DND) on future conflict scenarios that would justify expenditures on the F-35; (b) what meetings did DFAIT or DND take with other member countries of the Joint Strike Fighter program to discuss the costs of the F-35 jets; (c) what strategic studies have been conducted by DFAIT or DND on the role of F-35 jets in counter-insurgency operations; and (d) what strategic studies have been conducted by DFAIT or DND on

the role of F-35 jets in the protection of Canadian ground troops in future peacekeeping operations?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 561—**Hon. Bob Rae:**

With regard to the United Nations: (a) what recommendations has the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) put forward to improve the United Nations' effectiveness as an international tool; (b) what strategic reviews has DFAIT produced regarding the United Nations and Canada's role within it; (c) what briefing papers has DFAIT received or produced regarding possible reforms to the United Nations emergency relief protocol; and (d) what recommendations has DFAIT put forward regarding possible reforms to the United Nations emergency relief protocol?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 564—**Ms. Irene Mathysen:**

With regard to the October 29, 2010 announcement by Justice Canada entitled "Government of Canada takes concrete action regarding missing and murdered Aboriginal women": (a) what are the initiatives of this announcement; (b) what is the description of each federal initiative; (c) by fiscal year, how much of the \$10 million mentioned in the announcement will be allocated to each initiative; (d) by fiscal year, what is the planned total federal funding contribution for each initiative; (e) by fiscal year and source of funding, what funding contribution for the initiatives will be provided by other stakeholders, including provinces and territories; (f) what federal departments or agencies are responsible for implementing the initiatives of the announcement; (g) are there any third parties that will be involved with these initiatives and how much funding will they receive; (h) what is the process for reporting on these initiatives; (i) what was the consultation process prior to launching these initiatives; (j) what was the process for selecting which organizations would receive funding under these initiatives; (k) what was Status of Women Canada's role in developing these initiatives; (l) what was Indian Affairs and North Development's role in developing these initiatives; (m) what are the targets and benchmarks for each initiative; and (n) what is the result of the gender analysis conducted on these initiatives?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 566—Ms. Kirsty Duncan:**

With regard to chemical spraying programs conducted at CFB Gagetown from 1956 to 1984 and the government's management of their environmental and human health effects through to the present: (a) what is a detailed overview of the programs, in particular, for each chemical used in the spraying programs from 1956 to 1984, (i) what is its name, (ii) what were its years of use, (iii) what is its half-life, (iv) was it biodegradable or water-soluble, (v) does it bioaccumulate, (vi) in what area was it sprayed, (vii) how much of the chemical was used, including the number of barrels, (viii) how were the barrels which contained the chemical disposed of and how was this disposal monitored, (ix) how much did it cost to purchase the chemical, (x) how many people were living, recreating or working within five kilometres of CFB Gagetown in the years the chemical was sprayed, (xi) what concentrations or levels of the chemical are currently found in the area's soil and vegetation, (xii) based on a backward extrapolation from information about current chemical concentrations or levels, what concentrations or levels does the government estimate were present in the area's soil and vegetation in the years immediately following its use in the spraying programs; (b) were any sensitive areas cordoned off at any time since 1956 as a result of the spraying programs and, if so, what areas; (c) was compensation for damages paid to farms in the area surrounding CFB Gagetown from 1956 to 1984 and, if so, in what amounts; (d) what was the total cost of the spraying programs for each year from 1956 to 1984; (e) what is the ranking of the years 1956 through 1984 in terms of the amount of chemicals sprayed each year; (f) in what years and in what specific locations were each of the Agents Orange, Purple and White sprayed; (g) what are the details of every environmental and health and safety warning provided to Canadian Forces (CF) members, their families and the civilian population of the surrounding areas, in each year from 1956 to 1984, both before and during spraying; (h) for each year from 1956 to 1984, what are the details of any attempts made, additional to those in (g), to reduce human exposure to the chemicals used in the spraying programs; (i) what specific measures, including the communication of recommendations, were implemented to protect pregnant mothers, women who wanted to become pregnant, newborns and children, and what, if any, follow-up was undertaken with these groups after spraying; (j) for each year from 1956 to 1984, what are the details of any biological, environmental, and human health monitoring that took place in the area of spraying and surrounding areas, in particular the monitoring of (i) humans, (ii) animals, identifying each species, (iii) potable water wells, (iv) recreational areas, (v) recreational sub-watersheds, (vi) areas where CF members and civilians worked and recreated, (vii) areas where children played; (k) which of the monitoring programs in (j) took into consideration meteorological conditions at the time of spraying; (l) for each chemical identified in (a), what were the possible exposure routes for people living in and around CFB Gagetown; (m) following spraying and in subsequent years, what was the estimated load of Agents Orange, Purple and White found in (i) pregnant women, (ii) newborns, (iii) children, (iv) CF members, (v) the civilian population; (n) what poor pregnancy outcomes, birth defects, developmental problems, cancers and immune problems were tracked at CFB Gagetown and in CF families following time spent at CFB Gagetown; (o) for each chemical presently found at CFB Gagetown that does not occur naturally in the environment, (i) what is its name, (ii) what is its concentration, (iii) how does this concentration compare to the chemical's Maximum Acceptable Concentration; (p) what is the precautionary principle and how has the government applied it to the safety of the environment and the health and welfare of members of the CF and the civilian population at CFB Gagetown; (q) for each chemical identified in (o), (i) what environmental monitoring currently takes place, including the monitoring of soil, water and vegetation, (ii) what areas are considered to be contaminated by the chemical and a risk to human health, (iii) what areas were recommended to be cordoned off, (iv) what clean-up has been undertaken or has been deemed necessary, (v) what areas will remain cordoned off for the foreseeable future; (r) for each chemical identified in (o), what medical monitoring currently takes place of CF members, their families, and the civilians in the areas surrounding CFB Gagetown; (s) was a disease registry developed to track the health of CF personnel, their families and civilians in the areas surrounding CFB Gagetown who were exposed to chemicals used during the spraying programs from 1956 to 1984 and, if not, why not, and, if so, (i) when was the registry developed, (ii) who operated the registry, (iii) what information was tracked, (iv) what follow-up has continued to 2010; (t) what critical integrative analyses, such as longitudinal evaluation of cancer data, have been undertaken in Canada and what information has been made available to the public; (u) what efforts has the government made to understand the trans-generational effects of exposure to the various chemicals used during the spraying programs; (v) does Canada have an equivalent to the United States' Agent Orange Act of 1991, in particular, is Canada required to conduct updates of the science every two years to review newly available literature regarding Agents Orange, Purple and White and to draw conclusions from the overall evidence; (w) what environmental, occupational and veterans studies have been undertaken in Canada regarding exposure to Agents Orange, Purple and White during the last four years, and what were the findings; (x)

what years does the government recognize as possible exposure periods to (i) Agent Orange, (ii) Agent Purple, (iii) Agent White, (iv) other identified chemicals of major public health concern; (y) which of the diseases recognized by the Institute of Medicine as connected to exposure to Agent Orange are not recognized by Veterans Affairs Canada in connection with the provision of any form of compensation; (z) what are the details of Canada's compensation measures for individuals exposed to Agent Orange, in particular, (i) does Canada offer a cost-free Agent Orange registry health exam, (ii) what is the eligibility criteria for veterans' health care benefits, (iii) what kind of treatment is offered at war-related illness and injury study centers, (iv) what compensation is provided to veterans' children with spina bifida or other birth defects; and (aa) for Agent Orange claims, (i) how many have been submitted up to the day of the extension, (ii) how many have been paid out to date, (iii) how many have been denied and what was the reason for each denial, (iv) what is the average time required to process a claim, (v) how many claims are currently being appealed, (vi) what is the average time required to process an appeal?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 567—Mr. Paul Dewar:

With regard to the eviction of Canadian Forces from Camp Mirage: (a) what is the anticipated cost of (i) losing access to Camp Mirage, (ii) gaining access to replacement facilities elsewhere; (b) what has been the cost to date of (i) losing access to Camp Mirage, (ii) gaining access to replacement facilities elsewhere; (c) how much did Canada pay the United Arab Emirates (UAE) annually in rent for access to Camp Mirage in each of the years Canada had it; (d) how much will Canada pay the host countries annually in rent to access the new location(s); (e) how many additional landing slots and in which airports did UAE request for its aircraft just before it revoked access to Camp Mirage; (f) how many times did the Minister of Foreign Affairs meet with the UAE ambassador since the ambassador began his role in Canada; and (g) when evacuating a wounded Canadian soldier from Afghanistan to Landstuhl Military Hospital in Germany, how many additional flight hours are added by not routing that flight through Camp Mirage and routing it through the new location instead?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 569—Hon. Shawn Murphy:

With respect to the government's target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 17 percent from 2005 levels by the year 2020: (a) what is the government's assessment of how Canada will meet this target; (b) what are the government's estimates of Canadian emissions levels in megatonnes for each year in the period from 2006 through 2020, specifying the year in which emissions are expected to peak; (c) how many emission credits does the government estimate it will need to purchase to meet this target, from where does it intend to purchase them and how much it will cost; (d) what does the government estimate will be the carbon price under the carbon pricing scheme that the government plans to use for each year from 2010 through 2020; and (e) what, given the Minister of the Environment's October 29, 2009 statement that it is possible to meet the target with a carbon price of \$28 per tonne, are the details of all documents and assessments in the government's possession that examine how the target will be met with that carbon price and when and how does the government plan to implement that carbon price?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 570—Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:

With regard to the Applicant's Guide for the Aid to Publishers component of the Canada Periodical Fund: (a) what exact formula is used to determine the funding amount a publisher may receive, as mentioned in section 6.1 of the Guide, and is there a formula for the adjustments according to circulation volume, circulation method, type of periodical and audience and, if so, what is the formula; (b) why are farm publications the only ones not subject to the funding cap of \$1.5 million per year, as indicated in section 6.3 of the Guide, and which periodicals qualify for this exception; and (c) what percentage constitutes "majority owned and controlled by Canadians" as mentioned in section 3.1 of the Guide, and is there a difference between this percentage and the one prescribed by the Income Tax Act and, if so, what are the reasons for this difference?

Routine Proceedings

(Return tabled)

Question No. 571—Mr. Justin Trudeau:

With regard to all federal funding in the riding of Papineau for fiscal years 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010: (a) how many projects received funding from all departments or agencies over this period; (b) what projects received funding from all departments or agencies over this period; and (c) what was the value of the projects that received funding from all departments or agencies over this period?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 572—Hon. Maria Minna:

With regard to the telecommunications industry and the proliferation of new cellular telephone towers: (a) how many new cell phone towers have been constructed in the City of Toronto in each year from January 1, 2006 to November 18, 2010; (b) has Health Canada studied the short-term and long-term health implications of these towers and the electronic and magnetic fields (EMF) they emit and, if so, what were the results of these studies; (c) what does the government set as the standard for safe levels of public exposure to EMF; (d) how do the standards set in (c) compare to standards set in the European Union, the United States of America, China, Japan and Australia; (e) have there been any documented cases of health problems or birth defects as a result of exposure to EMF from cell phone towers; (f) what criteria are used to establish placement of these cell phone towers, including environmental, health, safety impacts, as well as proximity to schools, hospitals, day care facilities and seniors residences; (g) what is the proximity of each cell phone tower in the City of Toronto to the nearest school and what is the name of each school; (h) what are the average Canadian's exposure levels to EMF on a daily basis at home; (i) what is the exposure level emitted by cell phone towers; and (j) is the government regularly testing EMF from these cell phone towers and, if so, how often?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 573—Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:

With regard to Western Economic Diversification Canada, the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec and the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, how much did each spend on communication in each fiscal year from 2000-2001 to 2009-2010?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 576—Mr. Paul Dewar:

With regard to Canada's campaign for a non-permanent seat on the Security Council of the United Nations: (a) what are the total expenditures for the campaign; (b) what are the costs and descriptions of travel expenses incurred by each Minister, Parliamentary Secretary and their exempt staff where the campaign was a subject of discussion; (c) what are the costs and descriptions of hospitality expenses incurred by each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary where the campaign was a subject of discussion; (d) what are the costs and descriptions of gifts to foreign officials in support of the campaign; and (e) what are the costs and descriptions of printed materials produced in support of the campaign?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 577—Ms. Jean Crowder:

For each of the financial quarters from 2008 until today, what are the details of any contract between Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) and the following companies, including what prompted the issuing of the contract, who were the staff from the company that worked on the contract and what use was made of the results of each contract or what were the deliverables of the contract and, for each of the contracts, what steps did INAC take to determine if the contractee was lobbying INAC on other issues: (a) Laurier Research Group Limited; (b) Halifax Group; (c) Bay Street Research and Records Management Inc.; (d) Publicmetrics; (e) Centre for Public Management Inc.; (f) Delsys Research Group Inc.; (g) Accenture; (h) Canadian Development Consultants Inc.; (i) Hallux Consulting Inc.; (j) Stratum Associates; (k) Public History Inc.; (l) Wampum Records; (m) Stratos Inc.; (n) Workgroup Designs Inc.; (o) Joan Holmes & Associates Inc.; (p) Naut Sa Mawt Resources Groups Inc.; (q) Institute on Governance; (r) The History Group Inc.; (s) Forest Communications Inc.; (t) Smith Research Inc.; (u) Sea Mist Consultants; (v)

Nisha Technologies Inc.; (w) Prairie Research Associates Inc.; (x) Rawson Group Initiatives Inc.; (y) Bronson Consulting Group; and (z) Sussex Circle?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 578—Ms. Olivia Chow:

With regard to cases awaiting Ministerial Relief decisions from the Canada Border Services Agency, broken down by country, what is: (a) their number; (b) the average duration of wait; (c) the rationale for the multiple years of delays in making a decision; (d) the number of staff assigned to clear the backlog; (e) the number of cases appealed to the Federal Court as a result of an unreasonable delay; and (f) the cost to the government to defend these delays in Federal Court?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 579—Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:

With regard to the \$1.48 billion dollar investment pledged under the ecoENERGY for Renewable Power Initiative, for each of the fiscal years 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011: (a) what is the total amount of funding that was allotted; (b) what is the total amount of funding that was allotted to boost Canada's supply of wind sources, and who were the beneficiaries of that funding; (c) what is the total amount of funding that was allotted to boost Canada's supply of biomass energy sources, and who were the beneficiaries of that funding; (d) what is the total amount of funding that was allotted to boost Canada's small hydro and ocean energy sources, and who were the beneficiaries of that funding; (e) how many jobs were maintained by the Initiative; and (f) how many jobs were created by the Initiative?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 581—Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:

With regard to the \$400 million dedicated to Canada Health Infoway in Budget 2007: (a) what is the total amount of funding that was allotted for each of the fiscal years 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011; (b) what is the total amount of funding that was allotted for each province and territory in Canada for each of those fiscal years; (c) what were the specific projects, initiatives and undertakings developed as a result of the funding in each of those fiscal years; (d) what were the emergency room wait times in each of the provinces and territories in the fiscal year before said provinces and territories received their first increment of funding; and (e) what are the emergency room wait times in each of the provinces and territories, for each of those fiscal years, since said provinces and territories received their first increment of funding?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 583—Mr. Anthony Rota:

With respect to the compassionate care benefits administered by Service Canada: (a) how many Canadians or permanent residents applied for the benefits between the first day they became available and December 31, 2008, distributed by calendar year; and (b) how many Canadians or permanent residents received the benefits between the first day they became available and December 31, 2008, distributed by calendar year?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 584—Mr. Anthony Rota:**

With respect to the Federal Economic Development Initiative in Northern Ontario and each regional Economic Development Agency: (a) what is the detailed economic projection or forecast for each region of Canada with an Economic Development Agency; (b) what is the detailed economic projection or forecast for Northern Ontario; (c) in detail, what economic benefit did the Economic Development Agency for each region possessing such an Agency provide to that region; (d) in detail, what economic benefit did the Federal Economic Development Initiative in Northern Ontario provide to that region; (e) for each government project in Northern Ontario, what are the (i) name of the project, (ii) location of the project, (iii) amount of government funding, (iv) start date, (v) state of completion, (vi) cooperating agencies; (f) for each government project in each region with an Economic Development Agency, what are the (i) name of the project, (ii) location of the project, (iii) amount of government funding, (iv) start date, (v) state of completion, (vi) cooperating agencies; and (g) in detail, what is the projected economic impact on Northern Ontario of the establishment of a regional Economic Development Agency in Northern Ontario detailed in any and each government report examining, centrally or peripherally, a proposal therefor, produced between 2006 and the present?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 586—Ms. Kirsty Duncan:

With respect to long-term care (LTC) medical facilities for veterans: (a) by province and territory, what is the history and the rationale for the closure of LTC medical facilities for veterans including, for each facility closed, (i) the name of the facility, (ii) the number of beds closed, (iii) the date of each closure, (iv) what became of the facility; (b) what are the requirements for access to LTC facilities for (i) Second World War veterans, (ii) modern day veterans; (c) what are the health challenges and, if possible, statistics for each identified challenge for (i) Second World War veterans, (ii) modern day veterans; (d) what percentage of Second World War veterans in LTC facilities have dementia or mental health challenges; (e) regarding Korean War veterans, (i) what percentage of them are expected to develop dementia or mental health challenges, (ii) what additional impacts might Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) or traumatic brain injury play in serving these patients, (iii) by province and territory, what planning has been undertaken to meet this increasing demand, (iv) what, if any, thought has been given to developing specialized centres or beds to meet the increasing needs of this veteran population; (f) by province and territory, what are all LTC facilities (including hospitals, care, community care, and contract facilities) available to Second World War veterans and, for each facility, (i) how many beds are available, and how many were available at the facility's maximum use, (ii) what is the wait time, (iii) what are the standards of care, how are they measured and how often, (iv) what are all specialized programs available to meet the medical needs of the aging veteran population, (v) what are all specialized programs available to veterans to improve their quality of life, (vi) what is the average distance of the facility from a veteran's home or family, (vii) how many veterans are currently residing in the facility, (viii) what is the average stay of a veteran, (ix) what is the average cost per bed in the facility, (x) what is the average cost to the veteran, (xi) what is the average cost to the veteran's family; (g) by province and territory, for each LTC facility identified in (f) and modern veterans, (i) how many beds are available, and how many were available at the facility's maximum use, (ii) what is the wait time, (iii) what are the standards of care, how are they measured and how often, (iv) what are all specialized programs available to meet the medical needs of the aging veteran population, (v) what are all specialized programs available to veterans to improve their quality of life, (vi) what is the average distance of the facility from a veteran's home or family, (vii) how many veterans are currently residing in the facility, and how this is expected to change over the next five to ten year period, (viii) what is the average stay of a veteran, (ix) what is the average cost per bed in the facility, (x) what is the average cost to the veteran, (xi) what is the average cost to the veteran's family; (h) what are examples of (i) unique facilities, (ii) unique specialized programs to meet medical needs, (iii) unique programs to improve quality of life that might be replicated in other provinces and territories for Second World War veterans; (i) by province and territory, what are the requirements for Second World War veterans (i) to qualify to receive home care and health care benefits while they wait at home for an available bed, (ii) to be placed in a long-term care bed in a community facility; (j) by province and territory, how many veterans are currently on a wait list for LTC facilities (i) for Second World War veterans, (ii) modern day veterans; (k) how does Veterans Affairs Canada (VAC) determine what it will contribute to the cost of a Second World War veteran's long-term care and a modern day veteran's care, and what is the (i) average monthly pay-out for each group, (ii) short-fall that must be provided by veterans, families or caregivers, by province and territory; (l) by province and territory, what are the comprehensive statistics from 2005 to 2010 regarding the demand by the Second

World War veteran population and the modern day veteran population for beds, and what is the projection for demand over the next five years for each identified population; (m) by province and territory, for each LTC facility that do not appear to be using its full capacity, (i) what is the name of the facility, (ii) how many priority access beds are not being used, (iii) is there is a wait list, (iv) do forecasts show a need for beds in the future, (v) what plans, if any, are being made for the facility, (vi) how will VAC work with the facility and the province or territory to ensure a smooth transition; (n) what, if any, consideration has been given to expand the definition of eligible veterans for LTC facilities to include modern day veterans, and what eligibility criteria might be put in place; and (o) what challenges do modern day veterans have in accessing specialized LTC facilities, including, but not limited to, (i) competing with the general public for beds in LTC homes or hospitals, (ii) long wait lists, (iii) long distances from a veteran's home and family, (iv) lack of expertise to address veterans needs such as amputee rehabilitation, PTSD treatment, and severe body and head trauma?

(Return tabled)

Routine Proceedings

Question No. 587—Ms. Kirsty Duncan:

With respect to nuclear testing and operations: (a) what are each above-ground nuclear weapons trials in which Canadian military personnel participated between 1946 and 1963, and for each trial, (i) what was the number of Canadian personnel, (ii) what was their branch of the forces or to which branch were they related, in the case of civilian employees of the Government of Canada attached to elements of the air, army or naval forces of Canada for the purpose of scientific or technical support to the forces, (iii) what were their assigned tasks, (iv) did a radiation detection team go in before the test to establish the 'background' radiation levels and, if so, what were the measured levels, (v) what was the size of the test, (vi) what were measured levels of nuclear fall-out, (vii) what precautions were taken to protect personnel, (viii) what was the distance from the test, specifying, if any, varying distances for different groups, (ix) what was the length of exposure, (x) what were possible exposure routes, (xi) what was the average number of showers taken by those exposed, and any other decontamination methods employed, (xii) what were the measurements of contamination taken of personnel, and specifically any samples taken, (xiii) were any personnel measured for radiation levels after each shower or other decontamination methods employed, (xiv) were any health effects reported at the time of the test, including, but not limited to, nausea, diarrhoea, hair loss, radiation burns, vomiting, or radiation poisoning, (xv) was there any follow-up with personnel, including, but not limited to, dose reconstruction and samples, (xvi) is there any long-term tracking of health effects and trans-generational effects through a registry; (b) regarding Canadian military personnel and civilian employees of the Government of Canada attached to elements of the air, army or naval forces of Canada for the purpose of scientific or technical support to the forces involved in the two Chalk River Reactor clean-ups in 1952 and 1958, (i) what was their number, (ii) what was their branch of the forces, (iii) what were their assigned tasks, (iv) what were the measured levels of nuclear contamination in the Chalk River Reactors in both 1952 and 1958, (v) what precautions were taken to protect personnel, (vi) what were the measured levels of nuclear contamination of those exposed, and any samples taken, (vii) what was the length of exposure, (viii) what were possible exposure routes, (ix) what was the average number of showers taken by those exposed, and any other decontamination methods employed, (x) were personnel measured for radiation levels after each shower or other decontamination methods employed, (xi) were any health effects reported at the time of the clean-up, including, but not limited to, nausea, diarrhoea, hair loss, radiation burns, vomiting, or radiation poisoning, (xii) was there any follow-up with personnel, including, but not limited to, dose reconstruction and samples, (xiii) is there any long-term tracking of health effects and trans-generational effects through a registry; (c) what was "Task Force Warrior", (i) how many people were employed, (ii) how many blasts were they exposed to, (iii) were there witnesses and, if so, how far were they stationed from the blasts, and how were they protected, (iv) how many of "Task Force Warrior" members have died, (v) what was their cause of death; (d) in ascending order of magnitude, what were the exposure levels for all identified incidents in (a), (b) and (c); (e) in ascending order of magnitude, what was the length of exposure for all identified incidents in (a), (b) and (c); (f) combining the information in (d) and (e) and other dose reconstruction methods, what was the severity of the event in ascending order for all tests; (g) what, if any, poor pregnancy outcomes, birth defects, developmental problems, cancers, cataracts and cardiovascular problems were tracked among Canadian Forces personnel and Government of Canada employees who supported the forces, following nuclear testing and the Chalk River clean-up for the years (i) 1946 to 1963, (ii) up to 2010; (h) was compensation for damages paid to households, businesses, farms, etc. in the area surrounding Chalk River in the years following 1952 and 1958 and, if so, in what amounts; (i) was a disease registry developed to track the health of Canadian Forces and Government of Canada personnel and their families who were exposed through nuclear testing or the clean-up of Chalk River, and, if not, why not and, if so, (i) when was the registry developed, (ii) who operated the registry, (iii) what information was tracked and for who, (iv) what follow-up has continued to 2010; (j) what critical integrative analyses, such as longitudinal evaluation of cancer amongst the two populations have been undertaken in Canada, and what information has been made available to the public; (k) what, if any, efforts has the government made to understand the trans-generational effects of exposure to radiation through nuclear testing and the clean-up of Chalk River; (l) what are all environmental, occupational, and veterans studies undertaken in Canada regarding exposure to radiation through nuclear testing or clean-up of Chalk River, and their findings; (m) what process was developed to identify an appropriate form of recognition beyond pension for both nuclear testing and the clean-up of Chalk River, (i) who was engaged in the process both within and across government agencies, (ii) what are all relevant stakeholders who were engaged, (iii) for each identified group in (i) and (ii) what were their recommendations, (iv) how was each recommendation considered, (v) was the recommendation accepted or rejected; (n) what consideration was given to providing awards for "presumptive" radiation health issues, including cancers, and other health conditions, and why was the recommendation not

ultimately pursued; (o) how was the ex-gratia payment of \$24,000 calculated as a suitable award, (i) what are all relevant stakeholders who were engaged, (ii) for each identified group, what were their comments on the calculated figure; (p) of the 700 former Canadian military personnel who participated in up to 29 United States and United Kingdom nuclear weapons trials between 1946 and 1963, identified in Dr. Clearwater's report, (i) how many applied for the Atomic Veterans Recognition Program (AVRP), (ii) how many had one or more health conditions that might have been caused by their exposure, (iii) how many had children who might have had health conditions linked to a parent's exposure, (iv) how many would have benefitted through a presumptive awards program; (q) did additional people come forward who were not included in Dr. Clearwater's report, and if so, (i) how many applied for the AVRP Program, (ii) what processes did they have to follow in order to be recognized, (iii) how many of these were awarded an ex-gratia payment and how many were denied, and for each denial, what was the explanation given, (iv) how many sought an appeal, (v) how many were awarded an ex-gratia payment after one or more appeals; (r) of the 200 former Canadian military personnel who participated in the clean-up and decontamination activities in Chalk River, (i) how many applied for the AVRP Program, (ii) what processes did they have to follow in order to be recognized, (iii) how many of these were awarded an ex-gratia payment and how many were denied, and for each denial, what was the explanation given, (iv) how many sought an appeal, (v) how many were awarded an ex-gratia payment after one or more appeals; and (s) of the 900 identified people in Dr. Clearwater's report, by province and territory, (i) how many of the Canadian Forces members or National Defence Civilian Employees were deceased on the date the application was completed, (ii) what was the cause of death for each of the deceased, (iii) how many estate executors, primary beneficiaries, or primary caregivers of these employees submitted an application on behalf of the deceased, (iv) what were the specific guidelines used to determine whether or not to award the ex-gratia payment, (v) how many ex-gratia payments were granted to one of the following, namely, the deceased forces veteran or National Defence Civilian Employee's estate, their primary beneficiary, or their primary caregiver, (vi) how many ex-gratia payments were denied, and for each denial, what was the explanation, (vii) how many appeals were sought, (viii) of these, how many were awarded?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 588—Mr. Marcel Proulx:

Since the 2008-2009 fiscal year, what are all the contracts of less than \$10,000 awarded by Natural Resources Canada, including the supplier's name, the date, the description and the value?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 589—Mr. Marcel Proulx:

Since the 2008-2009 fiscal year, what are all the contracts of less than \$10,000 awarded by the Department of Finance, including the supplier's name, the date, the description and the value?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 591—Hon. John McKay:

With respect to the provision within the Official Development Assistance Accountability Act which sets out a duty of consultation for the competent Ministers: (a) which international agencies and civil society organizations were consulted by Ministers in 2008 and 2009; (b) what were the themes and subject areas of those consultations; (c) what were the views expressed by civil society organizations and international agencies on those themes and subjects; (d) how were those views taken into account when forming opinions under the Act; (e) did the consultation process invite consideration of the human rights impact of aid provided in target countries and, if not, why not; (f) was participation by international agencies and civil society organizations open-ended or limited to a select group of participants; and (g) was the consultation process public?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 593—Mr. Harold Albrecht:

With regard to the 2005 Montreal Climate Change Conference, what are the details of all contracts for goods or services relating to the conference, specifying for each contract (i) the name of the contractor, (ii) a description of the goods or services provided, (iii) the value of the contract, (iv) whether or not there was an open bidding process for the contract?

Routine Proceedings

(Return tabled)

Question No. 595—Hon. Bryon Wilfret:

With regard to the government's efforts to lobby support for its proposed purchase of F-35 fighter jets for use by the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces: (a) what are the details of all government promotion and communications efforts pertaining to this purchase, including Ministerial and Prime Ministerial travel expenditures relating to these efforts, as well as travel expenses of other government officials or representatives and members of the Canadian Forces who have been dispatched across the country to discuss this issue with private individuals or organizations (i) between January 1, 2010 and May 26, 2010, (ii) between May 27, 2010 and July 15, 2010, (iii) since July 16, 2010; and (b) how many person-hours have officials and officers from the Canadian Forces dedicated to promoting and communicating this purchase since July 16, 2010?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 596—Ms. Kirsty Duncan:

With respect to tobacco use in Canada: (a) for each year between 2000 and 2009, (i) on average, how many Canadian children started smoking every day, (ii) what percentage of 15-year-olds became regular smokers, (iii) how many adults smoked, (iv) how many working days were lost as a result of smoking-related illnesses, (v) what percentage of smokers who continued to smoke died before they reached age 65, (vi) how many deaths were caused by smoking, and how did tobacco-related deaths rank in terms of premature and preventable deaths, (vii) how many life years were lost to tobacco use, (viii) what percentage of Canadians gave up smoking, (ix) how much money did the government raise in cigarette taxes; (b) for the periods from 2000 to 2005 and 2006 to 2009, what were the financial and human health costs of smoking in Canada, including, but not limited to, (i) morbidity and mortality of smokers, (ii) morbidity and mortality costs of those exposed to second-hand smoke, (iii) drug costs, (iv) hospital costs, (v) institutional costs, (vi) physician costs, (vii) workers' absenteeism, (viii) future earnings lost by reason of death, (ix) fires; (c) is Health Canada required by law to refresh tobacco warnings and, if so, how often; (d) why has Canada not refreshed or enlarged the health warning messages that appear on its cigarette packages since 2000; (e) have any stakeholders (i) asked the government to revise the Tobacco Products Information Regulations (TPIR) to refresh the current cigarette health warnings, (ii) asked the government not to revise these regulations and, if so, who were they and on what date were these representations made; (f) with respect to the renewal of the TPIR, and since September 1, 2009, has any elected representative or official associated with the Prime Minister's Office, the Privy Council Office, Justice Canada, the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Industry Canada or Health Canada met with any industry associations, manufacturers or importers of tobacco products or their representatives and, if so, with whom and on which dates; (g) has the government reviewed the consistency of mandating health warning messages that occupy 70 percent or more of the principal display space of tobacco product packaging with international trade, intellectual property, investment or other commercial agreements to which Canada is a party and, if so, what decisions were made in this regard; (h) has Health Canada established a research work plan, policy or regulatory development work plan for the fiscal years 2010-2011 or 2011-2012 and, if so, what are the objectives of such a plan or plans; (i) has the government commissioned any studies to review whether revising the TPIR to increase the size of health warning labels would affect in any way the proportion of cigarettes sold in Canada on which excise taxes have not been paid and, if so, (i) by whom were these studies conducted, (ii) when were they completed, (iii) what were the conclusions of each report; (j) is the position of the government that it continue to examine the renewal of warning messages on tobacco packaging, but that it is not ready to move forward at this time and, if so, what detailed measures are being taken to examine the renewal of warning messages; (k) since January 1, 2003, what is the total cost of Health Canada's (i) staff time, (ii) commissioned research directed towards the revision of the TPIR; (l) did Health Canada research the use of an image of Barb Tarbox, who spent the last months of her life warning Canadians about the consequences of smoking, as part of a health warning message for cigarettes and, if so, what were the results of that research; (m) did Health Canada plan to add a toll-free, quit smoking number to cigarette warning labels and, if so, why have those plans not been put in place; (n) at the Health ministers meeting in September 2010, which provinces, if any, were supportive of (i) updating warning labels, (ii) establishing a national quit line; (o) has the government established reasons why it cannot revise the TPIR while concurrently pursuing a strategy to reduce contraband tobacco sales and, if so, what are those reasons; and (p) what consideration, if any, has Health Canada given to developing a bill to stop the illegal sale of tobacco products over the internet, by mail order and by the telephone, including the illegal sale to youth?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 597—Hon. Anita Neville:

Since the 2008-2009 fiscal year, what are all the contracts of less than \$10,000 awarded by Western Economic Diversification Canada, including the vendor's name, the date, the description and the value?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 598—Hon. Anita Neville:

Since the 2008-2009 fiscal year, what are all the contracts of less than \$10,000 awarded by Public Safety Canada, including the vendor's name, the date, the description and the value?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 599—Hon. Anita Neville:

Since the 2008-2009 fiscal year, what are all the contracts of less than \$10,000 awarded by Health Canada, including the vendor's name, the date, the description and the value?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 600—Hon. Anita Neville:

Since the 2008-2009 fiscal year, what are all the contracts of less than \$10,000 awarded by Human Resources and Skills Development Canada, including the vendor's name, the date, the description and the value?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 602—Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:

Since the 2008-2009 fiscal year, what are all the contracts of less than \$10,000 awarded by the Ministers' regional offices, including the vendor's name, the date, the description and the value?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 603—Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:

With regard to the Ministers' regional offices, since the 2008-2009 fiscal year, what are all awards and contributions of less than \$25,000 dispersed, including the recipient's name, the date, the description and the value?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 605—Mr. Malcolm Allen:

With regard to federal youth programs (16-35 years old): (a) what departments, agencies and commissions are responsible for administration of youth programs; (b) what are the names of youth programs each federal organization is responsible for delivering domestically and internationally; (c) how much funding was spent by each department and agency on youth programs from the fiscal year 2006-2007 to date; (d) how much funding was committed by each department and agency for NGOs focused on delivering youth programs; and (e) how many full-time equivalents are assigned by each department, agency and commission to administrate youth programs?

(Return tabled)

Routine Proceedings

Question No. 606—Mrs. Alexandra Mendes:

With regard to law enforcement operations set up by, and/or under the surveillance and control of, the RCMP to support security operations up to and during the G20 Summit: (a) how many U.S. Homeland Security officials and/or members of the U.S. Coast Guard did the RCMP Commissioner designate to serve as peace officers on Canadian soil; (b) how many U.S. Homeland Security officials and/or members of the U.S. Coast Guard did the RCMP Commissioner designate to serve as peace officers (i) for security operations in the shared Canada-U.S. waters of Lake Ontario, (ii) to help secure the maritime border between Canada and the U.S. from threats to national security, (iii) to prevent cross-border smuggling and trafficking; (c) of the total number of U.S. Homeland Security officials and/or members of the U.S. Coast Guard designated by the RCMP Commissioner to serve as peace officers to support G20 Security operations, (i) how many were already stationed on Canadian soil at the time of their designation to support security operations at the G20, (ii) how many were already stationed in either Canadian or American waters at the time of their designation to support security operations at the G20; (d) except for those that were either stationed on Canadian soil, or in Canadian or American waters at the time of their designation to support security operations at the G20, how many U.S. Homeland Security officials and/or members of the U.S. Coast Guard did the RCMP Commissioner designate to serve as peace officers to support security operations during the G20; (e) on what date did the RCMP Commissioner (i) designate U.S. Homeland Security officials and/or members of the U.S. Coast Guard to serve as peace officers to support security operations at the G20, (ii) revoke each of their appointments; (f) of the total number of U.S. Homeland Security officials and/or members of the U.S. Coast Guard designated as peace officers for security operations up to and during the G20 Summit, how many designations are still in effect and/or have not yet been revoked by the RCMP Commissioner; (g) what were the specific powers, authorities, protections and privileges to which any and all U.S. Homeland Security officials and/or members of the U.S. Coast Guard designated by the RCMP Commissioner were entitled in the course of supporting security operations at the G20; (h) what is the legislative framework authorizing the RCMP Commissioner to designate U.S. Homeland Security officials and/or members of the U.S. Coast Guard to serve as peace officers to support security operations on Canadian soil; (i) what is the total number of arrests made by U.S. Homeland Security officials and/or members of the U.S. Coast Guard designated by the RCMP Commissioner to serve as peace officers to support security operations at the G20; (j) what were the specific duties, services, undertakings and other such assignments undertaken by the U.S. Homeland Security officials and/or members of the U.S. Coast Guard designated by the RCMP Commissioner to serve as peace officers to support security operations at the G20; (k) did the Minister of Public Safety enter into any arrangements, with or without the approval of the Governor in Council, with the government of Ontario or with any other province or territory for the use or employment of any U.S. Homeland Security Officials and/or members of the U.S. Coast Guard designated to serve as peace officers by the RCMP Commissioner to (i) aid in the administration of justice in the province, (ii) carry into effect the laws in force in the province, (iii) support security operations during the G20; (l) did the Minister of Public Safety enter into any arrangements with any municipality in any province or territory for the use or employment of any U.S. Homeland Security Officials and/or members of the U.S. Coast Guard designated to serve as peace officers by the RCMP Commissioner, to (i) aid in the administration of justice in the province, (ii) carry into effect the laws in force in the province, (iii) support security operations during the G20; (m) if the Minister of Public Safety entered into any arrangement with the government of any province for any of the purposes described above, did the Minister of Public Safety cause to be laid before Parliament a copy of every such arrangement and, if not, will a copy of each of these arrangements be tabled in Parliament, as stipulated in subsection 20(5) of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act; (n) were the U.S. Homeland Security officials and/or members of the U.S. Coast Guard designated by the RCMP Commissioner to serve as peace officers during the G20 made to undergo any training or other such programs aimed at ensuring that the discharge of their duties was carried out in accordance with Canadian law; and (o) in what way were these officers identifiable, either (i) to distinguish them as peace officers distinct from Canadian peace officers or (ii) to make them indistinguishable from Canadian peace officers employed for security operations during the G20?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 607—Hon. Gurbax Malhi:

With regard to temporary residence visas (visitor visas): (a) in each year during the period of 2005 to 2010, for each Canadian High Commission, Embassy, and Consulate around the world, how many visitor visa applications were (i) submitted, (ii) approved, (iii) refused, including the reasons given for each refusal; (b) what regulations are in place with respect to compassionate considerations for visitor visa

applications; and (c) in each year during the period of 1986 to 2005, for each Canadian High Commission, Embassy, and Consulate around the world, what was the total amount of revenue collected from (i) all visitor visa applicants, (ii) applicants whose visitor visa applications were refused?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 608—Hon. Gurbax Malhi:

Within the constituency of Bramalea—Gore—Malton (named Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale from 2000 to 2004), what was the total amount of government funding since fiscal year 1993-1994 up to and including the current fiscal year, itemized according to (i) the date the money was received in the constituency, (ii) the dollar amount of the expenditure, (iii) the program from which the funding came, (iv) the ministry responsible, (v) the designated recipient?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 610—Hon. John McKay:

With respect to the call for proposals that has been launched by the Canadian International Development Agency's Partnerships with Canada Branch for Haiti Reconstruction and Maternal and Child Health: (a) what is the detailed assessment framework, including the percentage weighting for each criterion in the assessment framework; and (b) what is the basis for assignment marks for the achievement of each criterion by the submitting organization?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 611—Ms. Joyce Murray:

With regard to Environment Canada, from fiscal year 2008-2009 to present: (a) what are all contracts awarded under \$10,000 by the department, including the vendor name, date, description and value; (b) how many of the contracts listed in (a) were allocated to recipients in each province and territory, broken down by riding; (c) what are all rejected applications for contracts under \$50,000, including the vendor name, date, description and value; (d) what criteria were used to determine which contract applications were rejected; and (e) what are the projections for the awarding of Environment Canada contracts for fiscal years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, by the projected amount of contracts to be awarded and their value?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 612—Ms. Joyce Murray:

With regard to Sport Canada, from fiscal year 2008-2009 to present: (a) what are all contracts awarded under \$50,000 by the agency, including the vendor name, date, description and value; (b) how many of the contracts listed in (a) were allocated to recipients in each province and territory, broken down by riding; (c) what are all rejected applications for contracts under \$50,000, including the vendor name, date, description and value; (d) what criteria were used to determine which contract applications were rejected; and (e) what are the projections for the awarding of Sport Canada contracts for fiscal years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, by contract number and contract value?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 613—Hon. Bryon Wilfert:

With regard to the failed negotiations that led to the recent restrictions of the Canadian Forces' use of the Camp Mirage Air Base in the United Arab Emirates: (a) on a line-by-line basis, what are the known and estimated financial costs of losing privileged access to this base for the Canadian Forces; (b) on what date were these cost estimates completed and by which federal department(s); (c) on what date were these cost estimates submitted to the Minister of National Defence, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Prime Minister's Office, respectively; (d) what are the details of the expanded landing rights offered to the United Arab Emirates as part of discussions on revising the Canada-UAE Air Services Agreement, including details of all constraints on seat capacity and maximum flights to any and all destinations in Canada; and (e) has the Department of National Defence or the Canadian Forces completed a detailed analysis of how the restriction of the Canadian Forces' use of Camp Mirage will impact the mortality rate of Canadian soldiers ending a tour of duty in Afghanistan and, if so, (i) what are the contents and results of this analysis, (ii) which ministers had access to these results and on what dates did they receive access?

Routine Proceedings

(Return tabled)

Question No. 614—Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:

With respect to Bill C-32, An Act to amend the Copyright Act: (a) how was this Bill developed; (b) did the government request any specific studies for this Bill and, if so, (i) what was the subject of these studies, (ii) what conclusions did they reach, (iii) what recommendations did they put forward, (iv) what methodology was followed in the studies, (v) on what date were the studies requested, (vi) on what date were the studies submitted, (vii) do the studies contain quantitative analyses (are they supported by data), (viii) what are the quantitative data and in what context are they presented; (c) did the government request an analysis of the Bill's economic impact on creators' income and, if so, (i) what options did the analysis offer, (ii) what data were collected as part of the analysis, (iii) what conclusions did the analysis reach, (iv) were the ministers of Canadian Heritage and Industry Canada aware of this analysis before it began, (v) on what date was the analysis requested, (vi) on what date was the analysis tabled, (vii) who or which department requested the analysis, (viii) who or which department conducted the analysis, (ix) what guidelines were issued regarding the analysis, (x) to whom or to which department was the analysis submitted, (xi) did the Minister of Canadian Heritage read the analysis after it was submitted, (xii) did the Minister of Industry read the analysis after it was submitted, (xiii) was a minister or an employee of a minister involved in the analysis, or did a minister or an employee of a minister interact with the researchers at any time during the analysis, (xiv) what methodology was followed in the analysis, (xv) did the author(s) of the analysis state the methodological considerations or limitations, either in writing or verbally, (xvi) what are the methodological considerations or limitations stated by the author(s) of this analysis, (xvii) does the analysis contain a quantitative component (is it supported by data), (xviii) what are the quantitative data and in what context are they presented; (d) did the government request an analysis of the different ways of compensating artists for private copying and, if so, (i) what options did the analysis offer, (ii) what data were collected as part of the analysis, (iii) what conclusions did the analysis reach, (iv) were the ministers of Canadian Heritage and Industry Canada aware of this analysis before it began, (v) on what date was the analysis requested, (vi) on what date was the analysis tabled, (vii) who or which department requested the analysis, (viii) who or which department conducted the analysis, (ix) what guidelines were issued regarding the analysis, (x) to whom or to which department was the analysis submitted, (xi) did the Minister of Canadian Heritage read the analysis after it was submitted, (xii) did the Minister of Industry read the analysis after it was submitted, (xiii) was a minister or an employee of a minister involved in the analysis, or did a minister or an employee of a minister interact with the researchers at any time during the analysis, (xiv) what methodology was followed in the analysis, (xv) did the author(s) of the analysis state the methodological considerations or limitations, either in writing or verbally, (xvi) what are the methodological considerations or limitations stated by the author(s) of this analysis, (xvii) does the analysis contain a quantitative component (is it supported by data), (xviii) what are the quantitative data and in what context are they presented; (e) did the government request an analysis of the Bill's economic impact as far as fair dealing is concerned and, if so, (i) what options did the analysis offer, (ii) what data were collected as part of the analysis, (iii) what conclusions did the analysis reach, (iv) were the ministers of Canadian Heritage and Industry Canada aware of this analysis before it began, (v) on what date was the analysis requested, (vi) on what date was the analysis tabled, (vii) who or which department requested the analysis, (viii) who or which department conducted the analysis, (ix) what guidelines were issued regarding the analysis, (x) to whom or to which department was the analysis submitted, (xi) did the Minister of Canadian Heritage read the analysis after it was submitted, (xii) did the Minister of Industry read the analysis after it was submitted, (xiii) was a minister or an employee of a minister involved in the analysis, or did a minister or an employee of a minister interact with the researchers at any time during the analysis, (xiv) what methodology was followed in the analysis, (xv) did the author(s) of the analysis state the methodological considerations or limitations, either in writing or verbally, (xvi) what are the methodological considerations or limitations stated by the author(s) of this analysis, (xvii) does the analysis contain a quantitative component (is it supported by data), (xviii) what are the quantitative data and in what context are they presented; (f) did the Department of Canadian Heritage put forward recommendations for this Bill and, if so, (i) what were they, (ii) on what date were they put forward; (g) did Industry Canada put forward recommendations for this Bill and, if so, (i) what were they, (ii) on what date were they put forward; (h) with respect to the recommendations put forward by the Department of Canadian Heritage and Industry Canada, (i) by what process were the recommendations adopted, (ii) have other changes been made by parties other than the departments, (iii) did the ministers make changes to the Bill which had not been proposed by their respective departments, (iv) in relation to question (h)(i), what are these changes, (v) for every clause in the Bill, which department proposed the change, (vi) for every clause in the Bill, which minister proposed the change first, (vii) for every clause in the Bill, which

minister gave his support; (i) did the government request an analysis of the statutory damages and, if so, (i) what options did the analysis offer, (ii) what data were collected as part of the analysis, (iii) what conclusions did the analysis reach, (iv) were the ministers of Canadian Heritage and Industry Canada aware of this analysis before it began, (v) on what date was the analysis requested, (vi) on what date was the analysis tabled, (vii) who or which department requested the analysis, (viii) who or which department conducted the analysis, (ix) what guidelines were issued regarding the analysis, (x) to whom or to which department was the analysis submitted, (xi) did the Minister of Canadian Heritage read the analysis after it was submitted, (xii) did the Minister of Industry read the analysis after it was submitted, (xiii) was a minister or an employee of a minister involved in the analysis, or did a minister or an employee of a minister interact with the researchers at any time during the analysis, (xiv) what methodology was followed in the analysis, (xv) did the author(s) of the analysis state the methodological considerations or limitations, either in writing or verbally, (xvi) what are the methodological considerations or limitations stated by the author(s) of this analysis, (xvii) does the analysis contain a quantitative component (is it supported by data), (xviii) what are the quantitative data and in what context are they presented; (j) with respect to the legal analyses, (i) which ones were done to determine if the Bill complied with the standards of the World Intellectual Property Organization's Copyright Treaty and Performances and Phonograms Treaty adopted in Geneva in 1996, (ii) what were the results of these analyses, (iii) what were the recommendations of these analyses, (iv) were alternatives put forward, (v) what are these alternatives, (vi) who or which department conducted these analyses, (vii) on what date were these analyses requested, (viii) on what date were these analyses submitted, (ix) to whom or to which department were these analyses submitted, (x) did the Minister of Canadian Heritage read the analyses after there were submitted, (xi) did the Minister of Industry read the analyses after there were submitted; (k) was the Bill reviewed by Canadian Heritage employees and, if so, (i) did they make comments or criticisms or ask questions about it, (ii) what are these questions, criticisms or comments made by Canadian Heritage representatives, (iii) did the minister or a member of his staff respond to these questions or comments, (iv) what was their response to these questions or criticisms; and (l) with respect to piracy, (i) which studies were done to determine if the Bill can put an end to piracy, (ii) what are the results of these studies, (iii) what are the recommendations put forward by these studies, (iv) were alternatives put forward, (v) what are these alternatives, (vi) who or which department made these studies, (vii) on what date were these studies requested, (viii) on what date were these studies submitted, (ix) to whom or to which department were these studies submitted, (x) did the Minister of Canadian Heritage read these studies after they were submitted, (xi) did the Minister of Industry read these studies after they were submitted?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 615—Mr. Malcolm Allen:

With regard to the Department of National Defence's procurement of name badges for the uniforms of members of the Canadian Armed Forces: (a) where were these name badges made and what company supplies them; (b) how many name badges were produced on an annual basis from 2006 to date and how much money was spent; (c) are there any contracts to produce name badges awarded to foreign companies and, if so, from which countries and how much money did the companies receive for their service; and (d) how long does it take to order a new Canadian Armed Forces name badge?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 616—Mr. Glenn Thibeault:**

With respect to Canada's Economic Action Plan: (a) under the Infrastructure Stimulus Fund in the riding of Sudbury, (i) what applications for projects have been approved for funding to date, (ii) who are the partners involved, (iii) what is the federal contribution, (iv) what is each partner's contribution, (v) how much of the funding has flowed and to whom, (vi) what were the criteria used to determine which projects were approved; (b) under the Building Canada Fund – Communities Component in the riding of Sudbury, (i) what applications for projects have been approved for funding to date, (ii) who are the partners involved, (iii) what is the federal contribution, (iv) what is each partner's contribution, (v) how much of the funding has flowed and to whom, (vi) what were the criteria used to determine which projects were approved; (c) under the Building Canada Fund – Communities Component top-up in the riding of Sudbury, (i) what applications for projects have been approved for funding to date, (ii) who are the partners involved, (iii) what is the federal contribution, (iv) what is each partner's contribution, (v) how much of the funding has flowed and to whom, (vi) what were the criteria used to determine which projects were approved; (d) under the Building Canada Fund – Major Infrastructure Component in the riding of Sudbury, (i) what applications for projects have been approved for funding to date, (ii) who are the partners involved, (iii) what is the federal contribution, (iv) what is each partner's contribution, (v) how much of the funding has flowed and to whom, (vi) what were the criteria used to determine which projects were approved; (e) under the Recreational Infrastructure program in the riding of Sudbury, (i) what applications for projects have been approved for funding to date, (ii) who are the partners involved, (iii) what is the federal contribution, (iv) what is each partner's contribution, (v) how much of the funding has flowed and to whom, (vi) what were the criteria used to determine which projects were approved; and (f) under the Green Infrastructure Fund in the riding of Sudbury, (i) what applications for projects have been approved for funding to date, (ii) who are the partners involved, (iii) what is the federal contribution, (iv) what is each partner's contribution, (v) how much of the funding has flowed and to whom, (vi) what were the criteria used to determine which projects were approved?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 617—Mr. Glenn Thibeault:

With regard to the government's expenditures: (a) what was the total global amount spent on hockey tickets by each department, agency, board and commission on an annual basis from fiscal year 2006-2007 to date; (b) since fiscal year 2006-2007 to date, on an annual basis, how much was spent by each department, agency, board and commission on hockey equipment; (c) how much money was invested in building hockey arenas and how many arenas were built across the country under the present infrastructure programs; and (d) how much money was spent on advertising during hockey games?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 620—Mr. Malcolm Allen:

With regard to government advertising from January 1, 2006 to November 30, 2010, on an annual basis: (a) how much was spent on advertising by each department, crown corporation, foundation, agency, board and commission, broken down by type of media (television, radio, newspaper, magazine, non-governmental websites, search engine results pages, social network advertising, email marketing, video game, direct marketing, billboard, mobile display advertising, street furniture, cinema, outside wraps of public transportation, in-flight advertisements and other); (b) what companies received contracts to complete this advertising work in each department, crown corporation, foundation, agency, board and commission, broken down by type of media as enumerated in (a); (c) how much was spent by each department, crown corporation, foundation, agency, board and commission in each province and territory; and (d) how much was spent, broken down by country, by each department, crown corporation, foundation, agency, board and commission in international media?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 621—Mr. David McGuinty:

With respect to the office of the Prime Minister and the offices of all Cabinet Ministers on December 1, 2010: (a) how many exempt staff were employed in each office; (b) how many departmental staff were employed in each office; and (c) how many exempt staff did each office employ whose annual salary exceeds the maximum limit defined in section 3.3 of the Treasury Board's Policies and Guidelines for Ministers' Offices?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 622—Mr. David McGuinty:

With respect to Minister's Regional Offices (MRO): (a) what was the total funding for each MRO in (i) 2006-2007, (ii) 2007-2008, (iii) 2008-2009, (iv) 2009-2010; (b) what amount is currently budgeted for each MRO in 2010-2011; (c) how many staff were employed by each MRO in (i) 2006-2007, (ii) 2007-2008, (iii) 2008-2009, (iv) 2009-2010; and (d) how many staff were employed in each MRO on December 10, 2010?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 623—Mr. David McGuinty:

With respect to relief efforts since the earthquake in Haiti in January 2010: (a) what are all the programs and actions announced after the earthquake that were presented as relief for Haitians in the wake of the earthquake; (b) what are all governmental announcement and communications products pertaining to each of the programs and actions identified in part (a), detailing (i) who was present at the announcement, (ii) where it took place or was distributed, (iii) what were the desired headlines, key messages, media lines and desired sound bites described in the message event proposals relative to those announcements or communications products, (iv) the itemized and total cost of each of those products or announcements, including but not limited, to printing costs, costs of transporting staff and ministers, costs of renting the announcement venue, estimated value of public servants' work dedicated to the announcement or product, etc.; (c) as of December 10, 2010, for each program or action identified in part (a), what is (i) the amount of money committed, (ii) the amount of money disbursed, (iii) the amount of money committed that was not taken out of an existing governmental program (i.e., the amount of "new money"); (d) for each program or action identified in part (a), was this program or action ever announced or planned before the earthquake and, if so, what are the details of the announcement or the planning process (i.e., when, where and by whom); and (e) when possible, for previous parts of this question, what is the summation of dollar values across (i) all programs, (ii) actions, (iii) announcements, (iv) communications products?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 624—Mr. David McGuinty:

With respect to Access to Information and Privacy (ATIP) requests as of December 10, 2010: (a) what are all access to information requests addressed to the government that have not met the ATIP timeframe and that are currently awaiting a response; (b) what are the reasons for the government being unable to comply with each of the requests identified in part (a); (c) on what date was each request identified in part (a) received by the government; (d) what is the estimation of when each request identified in part (a) can be expected to be met; (e) what is the name and contact information of the individual who made each of the requests identified in part (a) (if this is impossible for privacy reasons, then identify each individual with an individual-specific number); and (f) for each individual identified in (e), are they known to be affiliated with (i) a political party, (ii) an NGO, (iii) a media organization?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 626—Mr. John Rafferty:

With regard to departments' involvement in the lawsuit filed by AbitibiBowater over asset expropriation by the Newfoundland and Labrador government: (a) what was the involvement of the Treasury Board Secretariat in this case and what departmental opinion was provided to the Minister and public regarding this matter during the period between February 20, 2010, and August 20, 2010; (b) what was the involvement of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade in this lawsuit and what departmental opinion was provided to the Minister and to the public regarding this matter during the period between February 20, 2010, and August 20, 2010; (c) what was the involvement of the Department of Justice in this lawsuit and what departmental opinion was provided to the Minister and to the public regarding this matter during the period between February 20, 2010 and August 20, 2010; and (d) what inter-departmental consultations took place regarding this case, what departments were involved, what is the outcome of these consultations and what is the implementation status of decisions made during the consultation process?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 627—Hon. Larry Bagnell:**

On what day in each of the last five fiscal years did each of Canada's Aboriginal broadcasters and the CBC receive their first cheque from Heritage Canada for expenses incurred in that fiscal year?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 628—Hon. Larry Bagnell:

With regard to the Environment Commissioners' report to the government, what are the equipment, boats and other vehicles needed for oil spill clean up in Canada's Arctic that are (i) owned by the government, (ii) pre-arranged for lease by the government, (iii) owned by companies for which the government has existing exploration approvals in the Arctic, (iv) owned by other countries that the government has conducted research in?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 631—Hon. John McCallum:

With regard to the full colour backdrops used by the government for announcements, such as but not limited to the announcement regarding Canada's response to the Major inquiry, for each backdrop purchased: (a) what were the date(s) (i) the tender was issued for the backdrop, (ii) the contract was signed, (iii) the backdrop was delivered; (b) what was the cost of the backdrop; (c) for what announcement was the backdrop used; (d) which department paid for the backdrop; and (e) on which dates was the backdrop used?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 632—Hon. John McCallum:

With regard to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation's Economic Action Plan funding for affordable housing, for every project funded, what is: (a) the name of the project; (b) the location of the project; (c) the program under which the project was funded; (d) the amount of federal funding broken down as (i) grant or contribution, (ii) interest-free loan, (iii) repayable loan, (iv) non-repayable loan with conditions; (e) the amount of funding from other organizations or governments; (f) the amount actually spent; and (g) the expiry date of the funding?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 634—Mr. Robert Oliphant:

With regard to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, what are all grants and contribution under \$25,000 awarded between January 1, 2009, to present, by including (i) recipient name, (ii) date, (iii) description, (iv) amount?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 635—Ms. Jean Crowder:

What is the total amount of government funding, since fiscal year 2004-2005 up and including the current fiscal year, allocated within the constituency of Nanaimo—Cowichan, specifying each department or agency, initiative and amount?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 637—Mr. Jack Harris:

With regard to the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA): (a) is ACOA part of the government's on-going strategic review and, if so, what is the purpose and rationale for a strategic review of ACOA; (b) how many ACOA projects were funded during fiscal years 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and the current fiscal year; (c) what is the breakdown by province and federal riding of the ACOA projects funded during fiscal years 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and the current fiscal year, and what is the allocated amount of funding for each of these projects; (d) how many projects were funded by ACOA under Canada's Economic Action Plan; (e) what projects have been funded by ACOA under Canada's Economic Action Plan; (f) how much funding was allocated for each of these projects; (g) what is the breakdown by province and federal riding for these projects; (h) what are the funding and full-time equivalent projections for ACOA for fiscal years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013; (i) how much core and project funding has been allocated for each regional development agency in each Atlantic province in 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and the current fiscal year; (j) how much funding was allocated to support operations of the Ottawa office of ACOA during the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and current

fiscal years; (k) how many staff were assigned to work in the Ottawa office of ACOA during the 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and current fiscal years; and (l) what programs or initiatives will sunset in 2010-2011 and are there any new programs to be launched in 2011-2012?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 638—Mr. Jack Harris:

With regard to the Atlantic Gateway Initiative: (a) what activities happened on this project during the 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and current fiscal years; (b) how much project funding was allocated for each Atlantic province and for each federal riding during fiscal years 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and the current fiscal year; (c) what federal departments and agencies have been involved in the implementation of the Atlantic Gateway Initiative since 2007 through to the present; (d) what are the funding and full-time equivalent projections for the Atlantic Gateway Initiative for fiscal years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013; (e) what private companies and consultants have received project funding under the Atlantic Gateway Initiative since 2007-2008 until present; (f) how much funding was committed to each Atlantic province and how much funding was committed by the governments of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Newfoundland and Labrador in order to match federal funding; (g) when is the Atlantic Gateway Initiative planned to sunset; (h) what is the government's position on the future of this initiative considering the global economic recession; (i) how did the global economic crisis affect the implementation of the Atlantic Gateway Initiative; (j) how many trade missions took place with regard to the Atlantic Gateway Initiative and what were the destinations and cost of each mission from 2007-2008 until present; and (k) what are the names of Canadian representatives from both public and private sector organizations who took part in trade missions from 2007 to 2010 at the government's expense?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 639—Mr. Todd Russell:

With respect to the government's efforts to secure a seat on the United Nations Security Council: (a) what were the expenses for (i) travel, (ii) printing, (iii) hospitality, (iv) rentals, (v) translation and interpretation, (vi) professional services, (vii) any other miscellaneous goods or services; (b) who received the contracts for the provision of each such good or service as identified in (a); and (c) to and from which locations and on which dates was the travel undertaken?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 640—Mr. Todd Russell:

With respect to First Nations treaty-making in British Columbia: (a) how many treaties have been concluded with First Nations in the province since January 1, 1990; (b) how many treaty negotiations are currently underway in British Columbia and with which First Nations; (c) how many treaty negotiations are expected to be concluded before December 31, 2011; (d) what are the mandates for the federal negotiators with respect to each such treaty negotiation; (e) are any such treaty negotiations affected or delayed by the Cohen Inquiry and, if so, which negotiation or negotiations and what are the government's plans to alleviate any such delay?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 642—Hon. Bryon Wilfert:

With regard to efforts to have Richmond Hill's "David Dunlop Observatory" declared a National Heritage Site: (a) what are the contents of all Heritage Canada departmental memos on this topic, excluding those memos that principally served to advise a Minister; and (b) what are the contents of all Finance Canada departmental memos on this topic, excluding those memos that principally served to advise a Minister?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 643—Hon. Bryon Wilfert:**

With regard to the government's intention to purchase 65 F-35 Lightning II fighter jets to replace Canada's current crop of CF-18 Hornets: (a) what is the current age of and total number of flight hours logged by each of Canada's CF-18 Hornets; (b) what is the average age at which all CF-18 Hornets are anticipated to be retired; (c) what is the anticipated average total number of flight hours logged for all CF-18 Hornets at retirement; (d) who at the Department of National Defence is responsible for interpreting and managing Canada's legal obligations under all Memoranda of Understanding with either the United States or Lockheed Martin with regard to the Joint Strike Fighter program; (e) where in the memoranda mentioned in question (d) is it explicitly stated that the government would be forced to withdraw from the Memoranda or from the Joint Strike Fighter program in order to hold a procurement competition for Canada's next fighter jet; (f) what legal counsel was consulted to determine the accuracy of this interpretation; and (g) if any, what dissenting opinions of this interpretation were offered to officials from the Department of National Defence prior to the June 16 announcement that Canada would purchase the F-35?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 644—Mrs. Lise Zarac:

With regard to Industry Canada, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did the department award from January 1, 2009, to the present, including the recipient's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 645—Mrs. Lise Zarac:

With regard to Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did the department award from January 1, 2009, to the present, including the recipient's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 650—Hon. Navdeep Bains:

With regard to the government's use of Advance Contract Award Notices (ACANs): (a) how many times has the government used this type of tendering since 2006; (b) what were the proposed procurements relating to these tenders; (c) which of these ACANs received a statement of capabilities meeting the requirements for another company; (d) how many statements of capabilities from other companies were received; (e) which of these ACANs were then moved to the full tendering process; (f) which of these were awarded to the pre-identified contractor; (g) on what dates were the ACANs posted; (h) what were the related response deadlines; (i) for those that received a statement of capabilities, when were the companies notified if they met the requirements; and (j) when were the contracts awarded?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 652—Hon. Navdeep Bains:

With regard to the Prime Minister's Office, Ministers' offices, and Ministers of State's offices: (a) how many exempt staff are based outside of the Ottawa area; (b) in what cities do these staff work; (c) what are the roles and responsibilities of these staff; (d) where are their offices located; (e) in cases where the government does not own the buildings where these offices are located, how much does the government pay in rent for these offices; (f) how much does the government pay in support of these offices, breaking down the costs into categories; (g) do any departmental staff work in the same locations; and (h) in cases where more than one office shares a location, which department pays for the cost of operating the office?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 653—Hon. Navdeep Bains:

With regard to the government's National Anti-Drug Strategy: (a) what is the total cost of this strategy, broken down by department and agency, for each of the fiscal years 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010; (b) how much is spent on advertising related to the strategy, broken down by campaign and then by platform type (i.e., print, radio, television, online), for each of the fiscal years 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010; (c) what is the cost of advertising, broken down first by campaign and then by ad development and cost to air or print for each of the fiscal years 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010; (d) how much is spent on program administration for this strategy, broken down by

department and agency, for each of the fiscal years 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010; (e) how much did the government spend on incarcerating people for drug-related offences in the above years, broken down by offence and drug type; (f) how much does the government spend on enforcement for drug-related offences, broken down by department and agency, for each of the fiscal years 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010; (g) how much does the government spend on the rehabilitation of people who suffer from drug addiction issues, broken down by drug type; (h) are there any plans for new programs to address drug use in Canada and, if so, what are they and how much is budgeted for them; (i) what are the government's performance indicators for its different drug programs; (j) what are the performance targets for the strategy for each of the fiscal years 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010; (k) what are the performance results for the strategy for each of the fiscal years 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010; (l) what groups has the government consulted with to develop its strategy; (m) how often is the strategy reviewed; (n) what are the projections for increases in drug incarceration based on the government's proposed drug legislation, broken down by offence and drug type; (o) how much has been allocated or planned for to address these increases; (p) what research has the government used in developing its anti-drug strategy; (q) into what research contracts on drug policy has the government entered since 2006; (r) who received those research contracts, what was their value and were they sole-sourced or tendered; and (s) which organizations have received grants or funding through the anti-drug strategy, how much have they received and for what purpose, since 2006, broken down by fiscal year?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 655—Mrs. Michelle Simson:

With regard to the \$735,000 spent on furniture and high-end furniture purchased from G.H. Johnson's Trading Company Limited during the G20 summit: (a) what are all items purchased and the price paid; (b) if any, what are the items that have been sold and the sale price; (c) what are all items currently in use by the government and by which department is it being used; and (d) what are all items currently in storage and what is the cost associated with the storage?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 657—Hon. Judy Sgro:

With regard to Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 659—Hon. Judy Sgro:

With regard to National Energy Board, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 660—Hon. Judy Sgro:

With regard to Canada Revenue Agency, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 661—Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:

With regard to Public Works and Government Services Canada, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 662—Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:

With regard to Canadian Tourism Commission, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 663—Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:**

With regard to Agriculture and Agri-food Canada, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 664—Mr. Kevin Lamoureux:

With regard to the Copyright Board of Canada, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 665—Hon. Irwin Cotler:

With regard to Statistics Canada, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 666—Mrs. Michelle Simson:

With regard to Privy Council Office, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 667—Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh:

With regard to Export Development Canada, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 668—Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh:

With regard to Canadian Development Investment Corporation, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 669—Mr. Todd Russell

With respect to criminal law amendments, has the government undertaken, or does it intend to undertake, any analysis of: (a) the gender-based impacts; (b) the impacts on Aboriginal peoples of the following Bills currently before Parliament, namely Bill C-4, An Act to amend the Youth Criminal Justice Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts, Bill C-16, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, Bill C-17, An Act to amend the Criminal Code (investigative hearing and recognizance with conditions), Bill C-23, An Act to amend the Criminal Records Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, Bill C-23A, An Act to amend the Criminal Records Act, Bill C-23B, An Act to amend the Criminal Records Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, Bill C-30, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, Bill C-39, An Act to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, Bill C-48, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and to make consequential amendments to the National Defence Act, and Bill S-6, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and another Act; (c) in the affirmative, for every Bill in (b), has any such analysis been undertaken internally or through the assistance of outside counsel or consultants and, if so, who were the outside counsel or consultants; (d) in the case of any outside counsel or consultants, for each contract for the provision of such services, what was the (i) date, (ii) value, (iii) file number; and (e) when was each such analysis completed or intended to be completed?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 670—Hon. Marlene Jennings:

With respect to legislation introduced by the Minister of Justice in the current session: (a) for cross-country consultations conducted in 2008 in review of the Youth

Criminal Justice Act, and in advance of the introduction of Bill C-4, An Act to Amend the Youth Criminal Justice Act, (i) on what dates, at what times, and at what locations did every consultation or roundtable discussion take place, (ii) who attended each consultation or roundtable discussion, (iii) what briefing materials were submitted by individuals attending each consultation or roundtable, (iv) what was the cost, including travel and accommodation for the Minister of Justice, political staff and public servants, for each consultation or roundtable discussion that took place, and in total, for this cross-country consultation, (v) why was the report produced in follow-up to these consultations not presented to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights until December 9, 2010, despite being completed on March 5, 2009; (b) in understanding that the dollar-amount costs associated with Justice bills are subject to Cabinet confidence, as indicated in the response of the Minister of Justice to question Q-457, (i) for each bill introduced by the Minister of Justice, has any estimate of the costs associated with such bills actually taken place, (ii) why were bills introduced by the Minister of Public Safety, as well as Bill S-7, An Act to deter terrorism and to amend the State Immunity Act, not subject to such cabinet confidence as dollar-amounts were provided for estimated costs of these bills in response to this question; (c) for Bill C-48, An Act to Amend the Criminal Code and to make consequential amendments to the National Defence Act, (i) why did the government introduce this Bill 216 days after the Speech from the Throne, despite there being minimal changes from a similar version of this Bill introduced in the previous session of Parliament, (ii) for each person convicted of more than one murder under the Criminal Code of Canada, what is the amount of time that this individual has spent in custody; and (d) for Bill C-21, An Act to Amend the Criminal Code (sentencing for fraud), for what reason are activities under subsection 380(2) not subject to a two year minimum sentence?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 671—Hon. Marlene Jennings:

With regard to the \$33 million dollars spent by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to finance the hiring of private security firms for the G8 and G20 Summits, as indicated in Chief Superintendent Alphonse MacNeil's report to the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security: (a) what were the names of each of the private security firms hired; (b) what were the specific duties, services, undertakings and other such assignments undertaken by each of the private security firms hired; (c) what was the exact amount paid to each of the private security firms hired; (d) what was the duration of each of the contracts entered into with each private security firm; (e) what were the names of each of the private security firms whose contracted duties, services, undertakings and other such assignments included direct interaction with members of the public; (f) what was the specific number of security officers or agents hired from each of the private security firms; (g) what were the specific powers, authorities, protections and privileges to which any and all of the employees of the private security firms were entitled in the performance of the duties for which they were contracted; (h) what was the legislative framework authorizing the RCMP to hire private security firms to support security operations during the Summits; (i) what has the total number of arrests made by employees of each of the private security firms hired for the G8 and G20 Summits; (j) did the Minister of Public Safety enter into any arrangements, with or without the approval of the Governor in Council, with the government of Ontario or with any other province or territory for the use or employment of any private security firms during the Summits to (i) aid in the administration of justice in the province, (ii) carry into effect the laws in force in the province, (iii) support security operations during the G20; (k) did the Minister of Public Safety enter into any arrangements with any municipality in any province or territory for the use or employment of any private security firms during the Summits, to (i) aid in the administration of justice in the province, (ii) carry into effect the laws in force in the province, (iii) support security operations during the G20; (l) if the Minister of Public Safety entered into any arrangement with the government of any province for any of the purposes described above, did the Minister of Public Safety cause to be laid before Parliament a copy of every such arrangement and, if not, will a copy of each of these arrangements be tabled in Parliament, as stipulated in subsection 20(5) of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act; (m) were the employees of each of the private security firms made to undergo any training or other such programs aimed at ensuring that the discharge of their duties was carried out in accordance with Canadian law; (n) in what way were these officers identifiable, either (i) to distinguish them as peace officers distinct from Canadian peace officers or (ii) to make them indistinguishable from Canadian peace officers employed for security operations during the G20; (o) why was it necessary to hire private security firms for the summits, rather than rely on provincial, municipal or territorial law enforcement agencies accountable to the public; (p) in what country, province, or territory is each of the private security firms hired for the summits headquartered; and (q) on what specific site(s) used at the summits did each of the private security firms hired operate?

Routine Proceedings

(Return tabled)

Question No. 672—Hon. Marlene Jennings:

With respect to Bill S-6, An Act to Amend the Criminal Code and another Act: (a) in follow-up to question Q-460, for every case in which the date of application for judicial review under section 745.6 of the Criminal Code is known, how many days have passed between this date and the date on which the offender was either granted or denied parole; and (b) for what reason does the government feel it is not necessary to provide notification to the families of victims that application has not been made, in the event that an offender does not make application under section 754 of the Criminal Code?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 673—Hon. Marlene Jennings:

With respect to each of the 13 airports in Canada that are designated as international airports: (a) how many violations of noise abatement procedures have occurred, by year, since 1990 and, for each of these violations, what sanctions, fines or otherwise, were issued, and to whom, by the government; (b) what enforcement mechanisms are in place to ensure compliance with noise-abatement procedures; and (c) does the government have any intention to introduce legislation or publish regulations to require airport authorities to conduct mandatory consultations with the public before changing flight paths?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 674—Ms. Judy Foote:

With regard to the Public Health Agency of Canada, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 676—Ms. Judy Foote:

With regard to the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 677—Ms. Judy Foote:

With regard to Status of Women Canada, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 678—Mr. Marcel Proulx:

With regard to the Veterans Review and Appeal Board, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 680—Ms. Yasmin Ratansi:

With regard to the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 681—Ms. Yasmin Ratansi:

With regard to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 682—Ms. Yasmin Ratansi:

With regard to the Canada Border Services Agency, what contracts under \$10,000 did it award from September 1, 2009, to the present, including the vendor's name, the date, the amount and the description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 683—Mrs. Bonnie Crombie:

With regard to Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 692—Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia:

With regard to the Public Health Agency of Canada, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 693—Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia:

With regard to Canadian Heritage, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 696—Mr. Scott Simms:

With regard to Status of Women Canada, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 698—Hon. Shawn Murphy:

With regard to Public Works and Government Services Canada, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 699—Hon. Shawn Murphy:

With regard to Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, what grants and contributions under \$25,000 did it award from January 1, 2009, to the present?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 704—Ms. Joyce Murray:

With regard to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, for every fiscal year from 2000-2001 to today: (a) what are the salary expenses for full-time indeterminate staff within Science Branch, Salmon and Freshwater Ecosystem Division, including area staff; (b) what are the annual operating funds for salmon assessment projects, by geographic area and species, and for the core Science program; (c) what portion of the salary funds are directed to stock assessment versus pure science and what were the associated total operating funds for those two activities; and (d) what are the various sources of funding for stock assessment and science?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 707—Ms. Libby Davies:**

With respect to Canada's Economic Action Plan: (a) under the Infrastructure Stimulus Fund in the riding of Vancouver East, (i) what applications for projects have been approved for funding to date, (ii) who are the partners involved, (iii) what is the federal contribution, (iv) what is each partner's contribution, (v) how much of the funding has flowed and to whom, (vi) what were the criteria used to determine which projects were approved; (b) under the Building Canada Fund – Communities Component in the riding of Vancouver East, (i) what applications for projects have been approved for funding to date, (ii) who are the partners involved, (iii) what is the federal contribution, (iv) what is each partner's contribution, (v) how much of the funding has flowed and to whom, (vi) what were the criteria used to determine which projects were approved; (c) under the Building Canada Fund – Communities Component top-up in the riding of Vancouver East, (i) what applications for projects have been approved for funding to date, (ii) who are the partners involved, (iii) what is the federal contribution, (iv) what is each partner's contribution, (v) how much of the funding has flowed and to whom, (vi) what were the criteria used to determine which projects were approved; (d) under the Building Canada Fund – Major Infrastructure Component in the riding of Vancouver East, (i) what applications for projects have been approved for funding to date, (ii) who are the partners involved, (iii) what is the federal contribution, (iv) what is each partner's contribution, (v) how much of the funding has flowed and to whom, (vi) what were the criteria used to determine which projects were approved; (e) under the Recreational Infrastructure program in the riding of Vancouver East, (i) what applications for projects have been approved for funding to date, (ii) who are the partners involved, (iii) what is the federal contribution, (iv) what is each partner's contribution, (v) how much of the funding has flowed and to whom, (vi) what were the criteria used to determine which projects were approved; and (f) under the Green Infrastructure Fund in the riding of Vancouver East, (i) what applications for projects have been approved for funding to date, (ii) who are the partners involved, (iii) what is the federal contribution, (iv) what is each partner's contribution, (v) how much of the funding has flowed and to whom, (vi) what were the criteria used to determine which projects were approved?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 713—Mr. Justin Trudeau:

With regard to the Minister of National Revenue, Minister of the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister for the Atlantic Gateway, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 714—Mr. Rodger Cuzner:

With regard to the Minister of State (Science and Technology) (Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario), what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 725—Hon. Joseph Volpe:

With regard to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Minister of the Environment, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 740—Ms. Olivia Chow:

With regard to the Temporary Foreign Worker Program, from 2006 to present: (a) broken down by year, how many employers indicated in Labour Market Opinion application that employees had been laid off in the 12 months prior to the application; (b) broken down by year, how many employers who indicated that employees had been laid off in the 12 months prior to their application did not provide a reason for the layoffs; (c) broken down by year, how many employers in (a) had their application for Temporary Foreign Workers approved; (d) broken down by year, how many employers in (b) had their application for Temporary Foreign Workers approved; (e) are there any financial requirements for employers who wish to participate in the Temporary Foreign Worker Program, for example solvency requirements and the ability to pay wages; (f) broken down by year, how many temporary foreign workers have returned to their country of origin with wages owed

to them; (g) of those temporary foreign workers in (f), how many still have wages owed to them; (h) what is the total amount of unpaid wages owed to temporary foreign workers; and (i) what is the average amount of unpaid wages owed, per worker with wages owed to them?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 741—Ms. Olivia Chow:

With regard to immigration sponsorship, from 1984 to present: (a) broken down by year, what was the average processing time by visa offices outside of Canada for sponsoring parents; and (b) what is the processing time at each visa office?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 743—Hon. Wayne Easter:

With regard to drainage ditches and their designation as “fish habitats”: (a) what are the policies of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) with respect to the clearing of drainage ditches due to their designation as “fish habitats”; (b) what is DFO's definition of a “drainage ditch” that distinguishes it from a natural water course; (c) what guidelines and procedure are used to assess if a drainage ditch is a “fish habitat”; (d) what is DFO's policy on allowing, or not allowing, the cleaning out of drainage ditches to improve the water flow and does that policy take into account the utility of the ditch for the user of the land that it drains; (e) how many drainage ditches have been assessed in order to determine whether or not they should be cleaned out, broken down by riding; (f) of the drainage ditches assessed, how many were allowed to be cleaned out and how many were not allowed, broken down by riding; (g) what is the policy that determines whether or not a land owner should be charged for cleaning out a drainage ditch; and (h) how many land owners have been charged for cleaning out drainage ditches in the past four years in each riding?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 744—Hon. Wayne Easter:

With regard to the government's Economic Action Plan and the province of Prince Edward Island: (a) what was the total amount allocated to projects in the province between the program's announcement and December 2010; (b) what was total amount spent; (c) how many direct jobs were created as a result of the expenditures under the Economic Action Plan; (d) what were the total expenditures in each of the four federal electoral ridings; and (e) what were the specific projects by location in each of the four federal electoral ridings?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 746—Mr. Don Davies:

With respect to federal initiatives targeting gangs in Canada: (a) since 2000, how much funding has the federal government provided in total; (b) what are the programs that have been funded in all departments, broken down by department, start and end date, location and funding amount; (c) what projects have been funded through the National Crime Prevention Centre's Youth Gang Prevention Fund, broken down by start and end date, location and funding amount; (d) when will the \$11.1 millions funding announced in 2007 for the Youth Gang Prevention Fund expire, and will funding be continued after that date; (e) are any federal law enforcement units dedicated to targeting gangs and, if so, what is the budget for these units and how many full-time equivalents do they employ; (f) what is the government's national strategy to target gangs; (g) what gang exit programming exists in federal prisons; and (h) within the last five years, what are the titles and dates of government studies or reports on gang activity in Canada?

(Return tabled)

Routine Proceedings

Question No. 747—Mr. Don Davies:

With respect to the deportation of foreign nationals from Canada, for the years 2009 and 2010: (a) on an annual basis, how many people are deported and to which countries; (b) how many were deported after having been deemed a national security threat, violated immigration rules, or received a criminal conviction; (c) how many countries does the government not deport people to due to concerns of violating the principle of non-refoulement, as codified in international law, including the 1951 Geneva Convention; (d) to which countries does Canada not deport people and why; (e) with regard to countries that have well documented human rights violations, what consideration is given to their records and their potential implications for deportees prior to Canadian government officials making final determinations on whether or not to deport persons, (i) which departments would be involved in such a consideration, (ii) which department is the final authority in making a determination; (f) on what basis would the need to deport a person trump concerns for that person's welfare after they are deported; (g) with regard to countries that are in the midst of a civil war, what consideration is given to this and its potential implications for a deportee prior to Canadian government officials making a final determination on whether or not to deport a person; (h) what is the annual travel costs of repatriating deportees, as a global figure and a median basis; (i) what is the annual cost of housing deportees in detention prior to their deportation; (j) what is the average time a deportee remains in custody prior to deportation; and (k) currently how many people are waiting to be deported?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 749—Ms. Denise Savoie:

What is the total amount of government funding for fiscal year 2009-2010 and for the current fiscal year, allocated within the constituency of Victoria, specifying each department or agency, the initiative and the amount?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 750—Ms. Denise Savoie:

With regard to greenhouse gas emissions (GHG): (a) what specific new measures is the government instituting to reduce GHG that will be in effect over the next two years and between 2011 and 2020; (b) what amount will be allocated in the next budget to deliver concrete measures to (i) support climate adaptation in Canada, (ii) reduce GHG from major Canadian emitters, (iii) incent conservation, (iv) increase energy efficiency for new homes and for existing homes and small businesses; and (c) what GHG reductions is the government committing to achieve in the next two years?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 751—Mr. Claude Gravelle:

With regard to the Non-Insured Health Benefits Program: (a) how many First Nations, Inuit and Métis people were covered by the program for each calendar year between 2004 and 2010; (b) how many veterans were covered by the program for each calendar year between 2004 and 2010; (c) how many people in total were covered by the program for each calendar year between 2004 and 2010; and (d) what was the total amount of coverage offered for prescription drugs for each calendar year between 2004 and 2010?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 752—Mr. Claude Gravelle:

With regard to the Public Service Health Care Plan (PSHCP): (a) how many people were covered by PSHCP for each calendar year between 2004 and 2010; (b) how many of these people were considered dependants for each calendar year between 2004 and 2010; (c) what was the total amount of coverage offered for prescription drugs for each calendar year between 2004 and 2010; (d) what was the total amount of coverage offered for private nursing services for each calendar year between 2004 and 2010; and (e) what was the total amount of coverage offered for eye glasses and contact lenses for each calendar year between 2004 and 2010?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 753—Mr. Claude Gravelle:

With regard to the Employment Insurance Compassionate Care benefit: (a) how many people applied to use the benefit for each calendar year between 2004 and

2010; (b) how many people received the benefit for each calendar year between 2004 and 2010; (c) what was the total cost of these benefits to the Employment Insurance fund for each calendar year between 2004 and 2010; (d) how many full-time equivalents (FTE) are assigned to the management of the benefit; (e) are there any evaluations of the performance of the benefit and, if so, what are titles of these evaluations; (f) has there been any compilation and/or analysis of complaints regarding the benefits and, if so, what were the major complaints regarding the benefit; (g) have any recommendations been made to improve the benefit and, if so, what were these recommendations; (h) have any of these recommendations been implemented and, if so, which ones?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 754—Mr. Claude Gravelle:

With regard to the Caregiver Tax Credit for each calendar year between 2004 and 2010: (a) how many people applied for it; (b) how many people qualified to receive it; and (c) what was the total amount granted in tax credit?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 755—Ms. Siobhan Coady:

With respect to government spending on announcements and press conferences in 2009-2010: (a) how many public announcements and press conferences took place; (b) in what city and venue did they occur; (c) what was the date of the announcement or press conference; (d) for what purpose was the announcement or press conference held; (e) was a backdrop supplied for the announcement or press conference, and, if so, what were the costs incurred for the design, development and installation of the backdrop; and (f) what was the total cost of holding the press conference or announcement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 756—Hon. Dan McTeague:

With regard to advertising by the Department of National Defence or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 757—Hon. Dan McTeague:

With regard to advertising by the Department of Veterans Affairs or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 758—Hon. Dan McTeague:

With regard to advertising by the Treasury Board or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 759—Hon. Dan McTeague:

With regard to advertising by Public Safety Canada or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

*Routine Proceedings***Question No. 760—Hon. Mark Eyking:**

With regard to advertising by the Department of the Environment or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 761—Hon. Mark Eyking:

With regard to advertising by Status of Women Canada or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 762—Hon. Mark Eyking:

With regard to advertising by the Department of Foreign Affairs or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 763—Mr. Michael Savage:

With regard to advertising by Health Canada or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 764—Mr. Michael Savage:

With regard to advertising by International Trade Canada or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 765—Mr. Michael Savage:

With regard to advertising by the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 766—Mr. Michael Savage:

With regard to advertising by the Department of Labour or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 767—Hon. Mark Eyking:

With regard to advertising by Industry Canada or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 768—Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:

With regard to advertising by Public Works and Government Services Canada or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 769—Hon. Ken Dryden:

With regard to a possible tax evasion scheme in Liechtenstein known as "Project Jade" and the information that, as of June 10, 2010, Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) was informed that 106 residents of Canada have over \$100 million dollars in accounts in Liechtenstein and subsequently reassessed 26 cases which revealed a total of approximately \$5.2 million in unpaid federal taxes, interest, fines and penalties: (a) what is the breakdown of the \$5.2 million assessed from the 26 cases, specifically in (i) unpaid taxes, (ii) interest, (iii) fines, (iv) penalties; (b) how much of the \$5.2 million has been collected; (c) how many of these cases are under appeal; (d) how many cases remain open; (e) how many of the 26 cases have been closed, meaning that the full amount of taxes, interest and penalties have been collected; (f) what is the breakdown (money collected in taxes, interest, fines and penalties) for each case; (g) how many of the account holders in the 26 cases have made partial payments and, of these partial repayments, what was the (i) largest amount, (ii) smallest amount, (iii) average amount; (h) how much does CRA anticipate it has yet to collect in (i) taxes, (ii) interest, (iii) fines, (iv) penalties; (i) with regard to the amount of money contained in the Liechtenstein accounts declared or discovered by the CRA, what was the (i) largest amount, (ii) smallest amount, (iii) average amount; (j) on what date was the CRA first made aware of the names of Canadians with accounts in Liechtenstein; (k) on what date did CRA begin its investigation; (l) on what date was the first audit of an individual account holder done; (m) how many of the 106 Canadians with accounts in Liechtenstein have had these accounts audited, reassessed or been the subject of compliance action; (n) how many of the 106 Canadians with accounts in Liechtenstein have not been audited, reassessed or been the subject of compliance action; and (o) how many tax evasion charges have been laid?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 774—Hon. Michael Ignatieff:

With respect to the decision to purchase 65 Joint Strike Fighters (JSFs), how much money has the government spent since May 2010 on: (a) flights to events for elected officials, exempt staff, public servants or others via (i) public flights, (ii) charter flights, (iii) Department of National Defence challenger aircraft, (iv) airbuses, (v) Transport Canada aircraft; (b) setting up and holding press conferences or media availabilities related to the JSF, including the date and cost for each; (c) hospitality expenses for events dealing with the JSF; and (d) hotel and local travel costs for anyone travelling on JSF-related business?

(Return tabled)

Routine Proceedings

Question No. 775—Hon. Michael Ignatieff:

With respect to all incremental expenses relative to relocating Canada's Camp Mirage capability outside the United Arab Emirates (UAE), extending until the end of the foreseeable use of the new base capabilities, including the ongoing training mission through 2014, and including, but not limited to, expenses involved in planning the move, in getting equipment and personnel moved (including, but not exclusively, fuel, amortization on equipment used for the move, personnel involved in the move), expenses involved in cancelling contracts with suppliers in the UAE, lost perishable goods, incremental costs of new suppliers (when there is a difference in price of supplies between the two base capabilities), leases for the use of new base capabilities and incremental expenses for transportation to and from the base capabilities (for instance, when flying soldiers from Canada to Afghanistan): (a) what is a (i) detailed itemization of all such expenses, (ii) total summation of all such expenses, (iii) summation by type of expense; (b) for expenses in (a) already incurred, what were the amounts paid and, if this information is unavailable, what are estimates of the amounts paid; (c) for expenses in (a) not yet incurred, what are estimates of the amounts to be paid; (d) for expenses in (a), (b) and (c) incurred in foreign currency, what is the value of those expenses both in the foreign currency and in Canadian dollars; (e) what is a detailed itemization of all expenses to be incurred at the new base capabilities; and (f) for information deemed sensitive due to national security reasons, could the answer state so explicitly and include a general description?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 776—Hon. Michael Ignatieff:

With regard to Advance Contract Award Notices (ACANs): (a) what were all ACANs issued between 1 January, 2010, and December 14, 2010; (b) what were all ACANs where an individual or company other than the identified supplier indicated to the government that it was able to meet the ACAN's requirements within the ACAN posting period; and (c) what were all ACANs that were eventually awarded to a company or individual that were not the original identified supplier, including the name of the company or individual that won the contract?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 781—Mrs. Lise Zarac:

With regard to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for Status of Women, what are the exact, line-by-line details of all travel and hospitality expenses incurred by the Minister and all exempt staff since January 1, 2009?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 785—Hon. Scott Brison:

With regard to the Decima focus group public opinion polling on pre-budget messaging research conducted between February 18 and 23, 2010, what are: (a) the five cities in which the ten focus group sessions were held; (b) the names of (i) government officials who attended at least one of the focus group sessions, (ii) the names of political exempt staff from any Minister's office who attended at least one of the focus group sessions, (iii) the names of any staff from Minister's regional offices who attended at least one of the focus group sessions; and (c) the total expenses incurred by each person identified in (b)?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 788—Mr. Brian Murphy:

With respect to the G8 and G20 summits held in June 2010, including preparatory activities like Sherpa meetings: (a) what are all gifts and promotional items paid for from the Consolidate Revenue Fund, including the value of each gift; and (b) who are the recipients, including name, nationality and role at the summit, and the gift which he or she received?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 792—Hon. Geoff Regan:

With respect to government funding in Montmagny-L'Islet: (a) for each of the past five years, what are all of the projects funded and grants awarded in the riding of Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, identifying wherever possible the recipients of the money; (b) for each of the projects funded and grants

awarded, as identified in (a), what is the precise name of the federal program whence came the funding for the project or grant; (c) for each year since and including 2005, what was the amount spent by each program identified in (b), (i) in the riding of Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, (ii) in each of the ridings neighbouring the riding of Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, (iii) in the riding of Haute-Gaspésie—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, (iv) on average, across the four ridings identified in (c)(ii) and (c)(iii); (d) what was the average amount spent each year, since and including 2006, by each of the programs identified in (b), in the riding of Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup (i) when the Member of Parliament for that riding was a Conservative, (ii) when the Member of Parliament was affiliated with another political party; (e) what was the average amount spent each year, since and including 2006, by each of the programs identified in (b), in each of the ridings identified in (c)(ii) and (c)(iii), (i) when the Member of Parliament for that riding was a Conservative, (ii) when the Member of Parliament was affiliated with another political party?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 793—Hon. Geoff Regan:

With regard to advertising by the Canada Revenue Agency or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 794—Hon. Geoff Regan:

With regard to advertising by the Minister for La Francophonie or agencies for which the Minister is responsible: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of the agencies for which the Minister is responsible since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 795—Mr. Marc Garneau:

With regard to the Property Value Protection Program associated with the low-level radioactive waste clean-up in the Port Hope Area: (a) how many claims have been paid out; (b) how much was paid out for each claim; and (c) has any construction started for the Port Hope Area Initiative?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 796—Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:

With regard to advertising by the Minister of Canadian Heritage and Official Languages, his department or their agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 797—Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:

With regard to advertising by Department of Citizenship and Immigration or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 798—Hon. Lawrence MacAulay:

With regard to advertising by Natural Resources Canada or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

Routine Proceedings

(Return tabled)

Question No. 799—Mr. Glen Pearson:

With regard to the Department of Natural Resources, for fiscal years 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 and the current fiscal year: (a) how much did the Department budget for the Port Hope Area Initiative; (b) how much did the Department actually spend on the Port Hope Area Initiative; and (c) how many additional requests were made to the Treasury Board for the Port Hope Area Initiative, for how much were these requests and were the requests granted?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 800—Mr. Glen Pearson:

With regards to hospitality expenses: (a) how much did each department and agency spend on alcohol in fiscal years (i) 2006-2007, (ii) 2007-2008, (iii) 2008-2009, (iv) 2009-2010; and (b) what expense amounts were authorized by (i) the Minister, (ii) a delegated exempt staffer in the Minister's office, (iii) the Deputy Minister?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 801—Mr. Glen Pearson:

With respect to the decision to purchase 65 Joint Strike Fighters (JSFs), how much money has the government spent since May 2010 on: (a) flights to events for elected officials, exempt staff, public servants or others via (i) public flights, (ii) charter flights, (iii) Department of National Defence challenger aircraft, (iv) airbuses, (v) Transport Canada aircraft; (b) setting up and holding press conferences or media availabilities related to the JSF, including the date and cost for each; (c) hospitality expenses for events dealing with the JSF; and (d) hotel and local travel costs for anyone travelling on JSF-related business?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 802—Mr. Glen Pearson:

With respect to Public Works and Government Services Canada, for every project over 5 million dollars which received money from the department in the last 5 years and which involved incurred or currently foreseen cost overruns of 15% or more relative to the initial predictions: (a) what is the name of that project and details on its nature; (b) what is the history of cost predictions for that project, including (i) dates of predictions reviews and amounts of the predictions, (ii) itemized predictions on the costs of different subparts of that project; (c) what are the reasons for the cost overruns; (d) what are the dates at which ministers or their close staff were informed of the cost predictions described in part (b), what was the name of the Minister or staffer that received the information and what is a description of the actions taken, if any, by the Minister in reaction to that information; and (e) what is, in percentage (compared with the initial prediction), and in dollars, the final incurred value or the currently expected value of the cost overrun?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 803—Mr. Francis Valeriotte:

With regard to advertising by the Department of Finance or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 804—Mr. Francis Valeriotte:

With regard to advertising by the Human Resources and Skills Development Canada or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 805—Mr. Francis Valeriotte:

With regard to advertising by the Minister of International Cooperation, the Canadian International Development Agency or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 807—Mr. Scott Andrews:

With regard to the Department of Human Resources and Skills Development and, more specifically, all pilot projects approved by the Department, what is the projected or budgeted financial impact for each of the pilot projects for fiscal years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 808—Mr. Scott Andrews:

With regard to the public-private partnerships for building infrastructure, as reported to the House of Commons by the Minister of Finance, for fiscal years 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 and broken down by province: (a) what projects have been funded, including for each (i) a detailed description of the project, (ii) the specific location, (iii) how much funding was requested and approved; and (b) what applications were received for funding but were not approved, including for each (i) the name and physical location of the applicant, (ii) the description of the proposed project, (iii) how much funding was requested?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 809—Mr. Scott Andrews:

With regard to the Department of Industry and, more specifically, the National Research Council of Canada, what are the detailed descriptions and results of the two projects funded for Dandy Dan's Fish Market Limited of Ship Harbour, Newfoundland and Labrador, approved on May 5, 2009, and September 13, 2010?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 810—Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:

With regard to advertising by the Department of Western Economic Diversification or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by each department since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 811—Mr. Scott Andrews:

With regard to advertising by the Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 813—Hon. John McKay:

With regard to advertising by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by each department since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

*Government Orders***Question No. 814—Hon. Jim Karygiannis:**

With regard to advertising by the Canadian Northern Economic Development Agency or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the Agency and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 815—Hon. Jim Karygiannis:

With regard to advertising by the Department of Justice or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 816—Hon. Jim Karygiannis:

With regard to advertising by the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the Agency and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

Question No. 817—Hon. Jim Karygiannis:

With regard to advertising by Transport Canada and Infrastructure Canada or its agencies: (a) what was the total amount of money spent by the department and each of its agencies since January 1, 2009, in multi-cultural targeted print, radio, television and web-based media; (b) what was the exact placement of each ad purchase; and (c) what was the target demographic of each advertisement?

(Return tabled)

[*English*]

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill S-6, An Act to amend the Criminal Code and another Act, be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: When the matter was last before the House, the hon. member for Winnipeg North had the floor. I believe he has four minutes remaining in the time allotted for his remarks. I therefore call upon the hon. member for Winnipeg North.

• (1520)

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the closing of my comments just prior to 12 noon, I had indicated that the principle of Bill S-6 was something we could support. The concept behind the faint hope clause is a good one and I suspect we need to look at ways in which we can provide those types of incentives for individuals who are behind bars to reform and change

their behaviour so that they can integrate into society in a better and more peaceful fashion and become a more productive citizens.

I also drew a comparison to something else that the government was doing over the last number of days which has a very profound impact. I did not make reference to the specific programs and I want to do that because I want to appeal to the government, to the Prime Minister, to deal with this issue in that the bill we are debating right now would not necessarily prevent crimes from taking place while, on the other hand, the government is cutting back on programs that would in fact prevent crimes from taking place.

I believe the member for Winnipeg Centre rose today with regard to a member's statement on the issue. My colleague from Winnipeg South Centre raised the issue in question period. It is the issue of the anti-gang programs that are being proposed to be closed because of the government's failure to recognize the value of these programs.

On the one hand, we are looking at a bill that would have very little impact on preventing crimes, whereas, on the other hand, we have a government that is looking at allowing for a circle of courage, an oasis, youth outreach projects, turning the tides. These are all youth gang prevention programs that could have an impact on preventing crimes from occurring. The government needs to put more time on dealing with programs of this nature and on how we can bring in and spend tax dollars in such a way that we would prevent crimes from occurring, as opposed to putting so much focus on trying to give the image that the government is being tough on crime. When I look at Bill S-6, I believe the government is just trying to send a message more than anything else.

I, too, sympathize with the victims of crimes and want to get a sense of fairness in certain situations. That is why I believe there was a need to review the whole issue of the faint hope clause. However, at the end of the day, I would be remiss if I did not emphasize that the government is cutting programs and allowing them to disappear by its lack of commitment and lack of action in dealing with what I would suggest is crime on the streets. The government needs to reassess whether it just wants to talk about getting tough on crime or whether it wants to actually act on it.

I can tell members that there will be a negative impact as a result of the government not funding the programs to which I have referred. There will be more crime in our streets. I would suggest that it will go well beyond just Winnipeg North and the province of Manitoba.

When we have an idea and when we have a program that is effective, we should be supporting it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes I will have an opportunity to speak to Bill S-6, but first I would like the hon. member to explain something I did not understand. What is the Liberal Party's position on Bill S-6? Do the Liberals plan to support the bill or will they vote against it?

Throughout our work in committee, the Liberals always seemed to be speaking against the bill, but at the last minute they decided to support it. I wonder if someone could tell me how the Liberal Party plans to vote on this bill. Will the Liberals revoke the faint hope clause they brought in in 1976, or will they maintain it?

• (1525)

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, we need to acknowledge that when Jean Chrétien was prime minister of our country he recognized that in certain situations we should not allow access to the faint hope clause. It was the Liberal Party of Canada that ultimately made those initial amendments to the act to make it even better.

When we look at the bill today, we recognize the original rationale that was being utilized to bring in the faint hope clause, but a number of things have happened since 1976 that we need to take into consideration. We recognize that the Liberal Party of Canada, through Prime Minister Chrétien, saw the merits of making changes to make it better. The Liberal Party does support the need to improve legislation.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I know the previous member who asked the question was looking for an answer and the answer he received was maybe. He did not receive a definite yes or no.

I want to make some comments on the member's speech and draw his attention to comments by Newt Gingrich and Patrick Nolan on January 7, 2011 in the United States. They have come around to the way of thinking of people here in the NDP and the Bloc whereby we look at dealing with issues of crime and best practices and look to jurisdictions that have successful programs.

For example, being from Manitoba, the member knows that the Manitoba government has been successful in reducing auto theft by 80%. The Manitoba government brought in legislation dealing with the proceeds of crime and has seized 21 houses, starting with the Hells Angels gang house. Those houses are worth about \$9 million to the treasury.

Those are things that work. We need to strip away the ideology. The Conservative government is basically following the Ronald Reagan solution of “three strikes and you're out”, filling up American prisons and yet the crime rate has not gone down. Right wing thinkers like Newt Gingrich have come around to our way of thinking saying that the U.S. needs to be smart on crime and that it needs to develop programs that actually work.

It does not matter what jurisdiction is implementing the programs or whether a right wing or left wing government that is implementing the programs, we need to know where it works. If a program works in Quebec, and many programs do, then we should be looking to Quebec as an example of implementation. If a program is working well in Manitoba, we should be looking at Manitoba. We should not be taking the Conservative government's ideological approach of saying that it does not fit within its ideology, that it wants to go back to Ronald Reagan's days and say that “three strikes and you're out” is the way to do it. We have had 25 years of that and we have not had good results to show for it.

The American system is bankrupting itself. Some of the states are in difficult economic times now and have to admit that they were wrong in the first place and are now letting people out of prisons. The Americans should have developed a rehabilitative approach to

Government Orders

dealing with drug issues and so on as opposed to putting people in jail for 20 or 30 years.

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the member for Elmwood—Transcona has caught the point that I was trying to emphasize with regard to the irony of having this particular legislation before us today and what the government is actually doing in terms of some of its budgetary action. It is, for example, cutting back on the youth gang prevention fund, which is an anti-gang program that will be closed.

The member is quite right. There are many good ideas around the world so that we do not need to re-invent the wheel in order to make significant progress but we need to share those ideas with the government where we can.

The member made reference to auto theft. Back in, I believe, 2004, Winnipeg had somewhere in the neighbourhood of 13,000 or 14,000 vehicles being stolen. After a lot of prodding from the opposition, the government tried to come to grips with how best to deal with that.

One of the things we found out was that a relatively small number of youth, I believe less than 200, were stealing thousands of cars. A number of them got caught stealing at least 30 cars. What happened is that a program was developed that gave special attention to the high offenders.

What we really need to do is encourage and support those types of programs. We should not only bring in legislation of this nature but act on programs that will actually have an impact on crime in the streets. As I say, this particular bill will not necessarily prevent crimes from taking place.

• (1530)

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Speaker, something is not right here and I hope my hon. colleague is listening. Let us stop talking about street gangs and car thefts. That is not what we are talking about here; we are talking about murder.

From my hon. colleague's response, I understood that the Liberal Party plans to vote in favour of this bill. If that is true, the Liberals are going to abolish the faint hope clause that they themselves created in 1976. Is that clear enough?

I want to know why they are choosing to support a bill that goes against what they have always defended, specifically, that criminals must be given the opportunity to return to society. That is exactly what they are about to do with Bill S-6, if they support it.

They need to stop talking about street gangs. We are talking about murder, are we not? My question is clear: do they want to give people one last chance? If so, they must vote against the bill. That is what I want to know.

[English]

Mr. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I know the member would like a simple yes or no answer to the question but he will not necessarily get the yes or no answer from me at this point.

Government Orders

What I can tell the member is that many gang activities involve murder. Yes, I can assure the member that there are in fact gang members who commit murder. I would suggest that the principle of encouraging better behaviour within our prison system is to better educate prisoners and provide them with the opportunity to gain skills so that once they are released there is less likelihood of them repeating their crimes. We are very supportive of trying to beat the revolving door syndrome.

Through time, legislation needs to be changed but we need to be sensitive in terms of the realities of the different stakeholders and the expectations of the Canadian public. I suspect that in time we will find out exactly how the Liberal Party will be voting on the bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, over the past six years, I have heard some interesting things in the House, but the argument being made by my colleague from the Liberal Party is, with all due respect, extremely flawed. His argument does not hold water and it is inconsistent with Liberal Party philosophy.

I am liberal-minded because for 35 years, I was a criminal defence lawyer. I have defended many murder cases.

There are some things I do not understand. In 1976, the Liberal Party agreed to vote in favour of abolishing the death penalty and instituted what we call the faint hope clause. Decisions on this have gone all the way to the Supreme Court.

The Liberal Party is starting to realize it is being tricked. If the Liberals vote in favour of Bill S-6, they will be opening the door to reinstating the death penalty. Is that clear enough? That is where the Conservatives are going with this. I hope my colleague will consult with his colleagues who were on the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. I can give him some arguments to convince his colleagues.

These numbers do not come from the Bloc, the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party or the NDP. These numbers were compiled by the Correctional Service of Canada. As far as I know, the Correctional Service of Canada is neutral. It deals with inmates and ensures that those who are released on parole deserve to be.

The Conservatives do not understand the first thing about the faint hope clause. I hope my Liberal colleagues will understand. The Conservatives want to defend the victims. There is nothing better than the faint hope clause, which was implemented in 1976, to ensure that victims are respected.

Allow me to explain. The faint hope clause was adopted in 1976. The first hearings were held in 1987 because the inmates had to serve their sentences after all. Since 1987, there have been 181 hearings. As of October 10, 2010—

Mr. Daniel Paillé At 10:10 a.m.

Mr. Marc Lemay: Practically at 10:10 a.m., as my learned colleague from Hochelaga says. As of October 10, 2010, 4,774 people were serving life sentences in Canada. Since 1986, 181 offenders have gone before the board. The Conservatives claim that not enough is said about the victims, but 181 applications were heard. Many more people could have applied, but some did not

because they knew that they, like the Clifford Olsons of this world, would not succeed. There are a number of them.

Of these 181 cases, 146 had their sentences reduced and 35 were rejected. That is close to 1%. But that is not all. Of the 146 inmates whose eligibility date for parole was moved forward, 144 have now reached the revised date for day parole eligibility.

• (1535)

Parole has been granted to 135 people. We will do our job and state the facts: 135 individuals out of 4,700 have been paroled. Just wait, that is not all. Of these 135 individuals, 68—just about half—have never had problems. We need to explain something that the Conservatives will never understand, and that I would like the Liberals to realize. When offenders are sentenced to life, when they are incarcerated for the rest of their days, they fall under the parole system, the Correctional Service of Canada system. Therefore, they are monitored and under the jurisdiction of the Correctional Service of Canada not just while they are in prison, but to the end of their days, until they die.

Thus, 68 individuals have been released, 35 have had their parole suspended but not revoked—I will return to that—and 23 have had their parole revoked. Thus, 23 out of 135, out of 181, out of more than 4,000. Only 23. I will continue. Of the 135 paroled, seven committed non-violent offences, and two committed new violent offences. Naturally, the Conservatives are focusing on those two. Two out of 141, two out of 4,000, committed violent crimes. Naturally, we wanted to find out if the offences were murder. They were not.

Since 1987, no one released through the use of the faint hope clause has committed murder. And that is a good thing, of course. Two individuals committed violent crimes. We asked the Correctional Service of Canada what type of crimes these were. There had been assault causing bodily harm and armed robbery. Clearly, these two individuals returned to prison and will probably stay there for the rest of their lives.

Why did I quote these figures? I did it because the faint hope clause works. The Conservatives have not understood this, but I hope that the Liberals will wake up and ensure that this bill never goes to third reading, that it gets no support and is defeated in the House.

The faint hope clause is a system that works. Generally, the Criminal Code is amended to adapt it, for example, if there are computer-related crimes or an increase in car theft, armed robberies or street gangs. Also, there were Hells Angels and the mafia. So we take measures to amend the Criminal Code. We have a system that works and that works very well. Why amend it? I say that it works very well because the parole board would never release someone convicted of murder if there were a possibility that the person would reoffend. It would never happen if there were a chance the person would reoffend.

Government Orders

•(1540)

There are significant steps that an individual must take before being released. Under the faint hope clause, the individual must first submit an application to a judge in the district where he or she was sentenced 15 or 17 years previously. It is the judge who determines whether the person is eligible to apply. If the Superior Court judge is convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that the individual is eligible, the judge empanels a jury. Despite what the Conservatives may say, it is not true that it is up to the jury to determine whether an individual is eligible for release. The only thing a jury can do is to determine whether the sentence should be reduced or whether the individual should be granted permission to ask the parole board for parole after one, two, three, four or five years. The jury would determine the timeframe.

The faint hope clause found in section 745 of the Criminal Code has been so clearly defined that I am wondering why we would now want to abolish it. This is not my opinion, but that of reporters, and I would like to cite a passage in support of this argument. Manon Cormellier, a reporter for the newspaper *Le Devoir*, stated the following in an article published on June 10, 2009: "What if a lack of hope were to destroy a convict's desire for rehabilitation, resulting in more violence and more problems in our prisons?"

It is obvious to us that if we deny the possibility of the faint hope clause to those who have been convicted of murder, they will have no hope of being reintegrated into society. The faint hope clause: the name says it all. The wording is clear. It means that such individuals can think about returning to society after 15, 17, 18 or 20 years have passed, but they cannot do it alone and they would have to be deemed ready to return to society.

I do not understand why the Conservatives want to do this. Actually, I did not understand why until I read that the Prime Minister stated that he was against capital punishment except in certain cases. Then I understood everything. I understood why this bill was being introduced: it is the beginning of the return of the death penalty in Canada. This is extremely dangerous. This door must be closed immediately. The only way to close this door is to vote against Bill S-6. We must vote against this bill because it removes the opportunity for individuals to be reintegrated into society. I have argued many cases and clearly murder is the worst crime in the Criminal Code. A life has been taken. The person responsible should not be allowed to return to society until they understand the seriousness of their actions, before they are ready to return and have served a minimum sentence.

Let us again look at the numbers. I did not make them up. Statistics have been compiled since the death penalty was abolished in 1976. Canada kept track because keeping statistics is one of our strong suits. The average incarceration time for first degree murder, before the slightest possibility of eligibility for parole, is set out in a study by the Correctional Service of Canada. This data does not come from the Bloc, the Liberals, the NDP or the Conservatives. It comes from the Correctional Service of Canada.

•(1545)

The average time served is now 22.4 years. This means that offenders, even if they have the right to apply for parole after 15 or 17 years, serve on average 22.6 years before even being eligible for

parole. This means that the Correctional Service of Canada and the National Parole Board are doing a good job. And the government wants to change that? It makes no sense.

It works so well that we have very few cases of repeat offences. Since 1987, two violent crimes have been committed by individuals who have been released and 23 individuals have violated their parole conditions. They returned to prison. Here is what the Conservatives do not get: someone who is handed over to the Correctional Service of Canada for murder is imprisoned for life. I encourage my Conservative and Liberal colleagues to read section 745 of the Criminal Code. It clearly states that someone who is convicted of murder is sentenced to imprisonment for life. As far as I know, a life sentence is not 1, 2, 15 or 18 years in prison, it is life in prison. The individual is under the control of the Correctional Service of Canada for the rest of his life. As we say, he had better stay on the straight and narrow.

I have handled many cases and files that I could spend an hour talking about. The people from the Correctional Service of Canada who came to the committee asked why we were tinkering with a system that worked really well. The Conservatives responded that they wanted to be tough on crime. That makes no sense. Murder is the worst crime and a convicted murderer is sentenced to life in prison. He cannot get out unless he is ready to return to society.

The Conservatives claim to protect victims. But the victim's biggest advocate in this case is the Correctional Service of Canada and its parole board, which, since 1987, has been on the ball. They are good. Everyone released under the faint hope clause has behaved well, with the exception of two people. Two out of 181 is less than 1%.

If the House wants me to speak for another half-hour I would be happy to. In conclusion, I urge the Liberals, who brought in the faint hope clause, to think about this carefully. If Bill S-6 is passed, I guarantee that we will soon see the return of backbenchers' bills aiming to bring back the death penalty. That is unacceptable and we will never go along with that.

•(1550)

[English]

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I think the member hopes he will be able to appeal successfully to the Liberals. I would suggest he give up on that idea. I think the Liberals have already decided that they will follow the Conservatives in this venture for short-term political gain and will give up on the history of their party, going back to 1976 when it did show leadership on this issue.

It is interesting that this all comes about at a time when the United States is starting to reassess its system. When right-wing leaders such as Newt Gingrich, who was one of the top Republican leaders a number of years ago, and still is, come up with conclusions that basically agree with what the NDP and the Bloc have argued in the House on a number of crime issues, that is pretty amazing. He uses examples in the United States where the Republicans have come together with the Democrats to look at systems that actually work and have reduced the number of people in the prison populations in certain states. There is a lower rate of crime as a result of this and it is a much less cost to the taxpayers.

Government Orders

The government is looking at spending \$9 billion on new prison construction. It is going against where the world is moving, especially when we look at the United States right now.

Would the member like to comment on those points?

• (1555)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Speaker, I have defended lost causes. It has happened that the court said it would re-examine a case in detail and that arguments have been brought before it that may not have been seen before. That is exactly what I have been doing. Some Liberals may tell their colleagues that they established the faint hope clause in 1976; that it was their political party that has defended it tooth and nail since then, despite all the attacks; that they are the ones who enforced respect for the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and the ones who put it in place in 1982.

And we are the ones who are afraid to be tough on crime? I cannot agree with that. Voting against Bill S-6 does not mean we are not tough on crime. On the contrary, it means we respect the Charter. I repeat that the faint hope clause works very well and has proven to be useful. We do not need Bill S-6 to get rid of what is working well.

Mr. Daniel Paillé (Hochelaga, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge my colleague's experience and way of speaking. His eloquence was clear as he began by saying that his remarks would sting. It reminded me of the day that I went to his riding when we began our prebudget consultations. He told us to hang onto our hats because it was going to hurt.

Knowing his characteristic seriousness, I was surprised and impressed that this distinguished criminal lawyer used figures. I would like to draw a parallel. He said that the current system put in place by our Liberal colleagues works very well and he asked why the government would change it. We could ask the same thing about Canada's securities regulatory system, which works well. Why change it?

Has my distinguished colleague given any consideration to the fact that the Conservatives have a habit of not fixing things that are broken, but attacking things that work fine?

Earlier, my colleague asked for an additional half an hour. I will quickly take my seat and ask him to keep up the good work and convince our Liberal friends to vote as we will and to continue to uphold the law that currently exists. I turn the floor over to my colleague, who is extremely eloquent.

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from Hochelaga, who has skilfully replaced our colleague Réal Ménard. I learned a great deal from Réal Ménard, and I sat with him on the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. Mr. Ménard is not a lawyer, but he was definitely eloquent when it came to his files.

Since I became a member of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights in 2006, we have been swamped with bills. It is incredible. I was shocked. We are unbelievably busy. We seem to agree on some things. For anything related to cybercrime, things move quickly; we agree on that. I say we do away with parole after one-sixth of a sentence is served. I am a criminal lawyer—I defend criminals—but I agree with eliminating the one-sixth rule. I even used to tell my clients that they would get three years, but with the

one-sixth rule, they would get out after six or seven months. We now realize that serving one-sixth of a sentence is not that. That is what shocks people. What shocks people is not the sentence that a criminal receives, but rather that he does not serve his sentence in prison.

With this bill, what happens is the opposite, because with the faint hope clause at this time, not only do offenders serve their time, but for the rest of their lives, they will not be released unless they can demonstrate that they are fully rehabilitated and fully capable of returning to society. At present, the Correctional Service of Canada controls that and it works. I do not see why we would change that.

• (1600)

Mr. Raynald Blais (Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have a question based on what I just heard. Why would anyone want to change that? Why such eagerness and interest? The people listening to us talk about this issue would really like to get to the truth of the matter. What is the strategy behind all this? Is there one? Can we see a strategy? What is the real reason for creating so much confusion that after saying one thing, they turn around and do the opposite?

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague.

It took hearing the interview with the Prime Minister. He was asked whether he was in favour of the death penalty. He said no, that he would never reopen that debate, but that there were times when the death penalty might apply. That is when I understood where they were going with Bill S-6. It is the cornerstone. It is opening the door to reinstating the death penalty in Canada. That is precisely what is happening. This is the first step.

With all due respect, what I do not understand about the Conservatives is this idea of being tough on crime. Of course certain criminals deserve to go to prison. I have no problem with that. The problem is that we have to make them serve their time. Even if an individual is given an additional two years, he is still eligible for parole after one-sixth of his sentence. We just saw that with Mr. Lacroix from Norbourg. That guy was sentenced to 13 years, but he served only two. Why? Because he was eligible after one-sixth of the sentence. He is not dangerous. He was not violent in detention.

In the matter before us, a person who kills someone commits the worst crime under the Criminal Code. It is the worst crime a person can commit. Before that person has any chance of returning to society, we have to be sure that he is ready and able to return. That is exactly how the faint hope clause works. It was implemented in 1976 and it works very well. Again, out of more than 4,000 individuals who have had the right to apply for it, only 181 have done so. Out of that 181, only 147 have been successful and there have been only two recidivists. I was looking for this information earlier. Here it is: assault with a weapon charge in one case and robbery in the other case. I can assure you, we checked, these individuals are still locked up. The situation is under control. Eliminating the faint hope clause is unacceptable.

[*English*]

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have really enjoyed my time in the House this afternoon, particularly listening to the speech of my colleague from Abitibi—Témiscamingue.

Government Orders

He may want to know that I received an email from one of my constituents who is at home watching the debate on CPAC and who said that the member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue was very refreshing and that it was nice to see someone speaking in the House on this issue who made some sense. I congratulate him.

The member already went over a lot of the numbers. I know I will repeat some of them, but they absolutely bear repeating, especially when we had Don Head testify at committee. He is the Commissioner of the Correctional Service Canada. He is not partisan. He is not working for us, or the Bloc or the Conservatives. He was there as the commissioner. He said that, as of October 2010, there were 1,508 offenders with cases applicable for judicial review.

Here are some of the numbers he brought to committee. Since the first judicial review hearing in 1987, there had been a total of 181 court decisions. Of those 181, 146 of the court decisions resulted in a reduction of a period that must be served before parole eligibility and 35 of them ended in a refusal.

Since 1987, we have only had 146. That is about six a year. To put things in context, since 1987, of the literally thousands of offenders who were eligible for parole early, only 181 applied. Of those 181, 146 received a reduction in their sentence.

This is really important. Less than 15% of the people who are incarcerated with no eligibility of parole for 25 years have even made the application. In addition, most applications do not commence at the 15-year mark. In fact, most of them start at the 17 or 18-year mark.

Those are some of the numbers. As we can see, it is not a great horde of inmates who use this as a loophole or a get out of jail free card. They are serving their sentences. Some are applying, some are being approved and, consequently, some are being rejected, like with any good process for decision making. The system is not broken.

Something that the numbers do not show, and if there is time I will get back to the numbers, is the purpose of the faint hope clause. It increases the safety of fellow inmates. It increases the safety of workers. It makes our federal prisons a better place to be, where people are engaging in good behaviour and, more important, rehabilitative behaviour. It promotes good behaviour because it holds out faint hope, which is exactly the point.

If people are convicted of murder, and frankly it does not actually matter whether or not they committed the murder, why would they comply with treatment? Why would they listen to the guards or their doctors about what kind of treatment or programs were needed?

If people receive a 25 year sentence and if they think they are there for 25 years, there is absolutely no reason to engage in good behaviour or in rehabilitation programs. Faint hope holds out exactly that, faint hope.

Addiction counselling, anger management, mental health supports, why would inmates even bother engaging with that stuff if they know they are in prison for 25 years and there is no hope. There is no reason to get along with fellow inmates because there is no chance, no hope and no reason for good behaviour because good behaviour will not actually help them.

It is not just about good behaviour; it is also about rehabilitation. If that is the case, why would an inmate engage in the rehabilitation process. If that is what is happening, if there is no reason to be involved, then we have to own up to the fact that when we release inmates after they have served their time, they are not necessarily rehabilitated.

There is a huge flaw in the thinking that this is sound public policy. It does not make any sense.

Time and time again, on crime and punishment issues, the government takes its cues from the U.S., from the failed policies of the United States such as more prisons, “three strikes, you’re out”, mandatory minimums and, in particular, mandatory minimums for drug offences, which evidence shows do not work.

● (1605)

I sat in the justice committee and I listened to testimony about mandatory minimums on drug offences. Over and over again, we heard that they did not work. We heard in fact that policy-makers in the United States were retreating from that line of thinking. However, here we are following them when we know it is not working, when we know that what works is the four pillars approach: harm reduction, prevention, treatment and enforcement. We know that works, but instead we will do something that is outdated and that has been proven not to work.

Testimony at justice committee showed that it did not work, yet the Conservative government says that it is a great idea, that it will go ahead with it, that it will follow failed policies.

It is not about what is working, clearly. It is not about what does not work. What the government is about is ideology.

For those of us who do not subscribe to that ideology, do we give up hope? Does this ideology mean that the Conservatives will never see reason, that they will never be reasonable?

Interestingly, I do not think that is what that means necessarily. We heard earlier from some of my colleagues that Newt Gingrich, if we can believe, recently wrote an article with Pat Nolan about this issue. I think it was in the *Washington Post* on January 7. If Newt Gingrich can come around, surely to goodness those guys can come around. Plain and simple, the article is remarkable. I want to read from it because I think anybody who is listening at home and my colleagues here will be so surprised. The article states:

With nearly all 50 states facing budget deficits, it's time to end business as usual in state capitols and for legislators to think and act with courage and creativity.

We urge conservative legislators to lead the way in addressing an issue often considered off-limits to reform: prisons. Several states have recently shown that they can save on costs without compromising public safety by intelligently reducing their prison populations.

It continues:

Government Orders

We joined with other conservative leaders last month to announce the Right on Crime Campaign, a national movement urging states to make sensible and proven reforms to our criminal justice system—policies that will cut prison costs while keeping the public safe. Among the prominent signatories are Reagan administration attorney general Ed Meese, former drug czar Asa Hutchinson, David Keene of the American Conservative Union, John Dilulio of the University of Pennsylvania, Grover Norquist of Americans for Tax Reform and Richard Viguerie of ConservativeHQ.com. We all agree that we can keep the public safe while spending fewer tax dollars if we spend them more effectively.

The Right on Crime Campaign represents a seismic shift in the legislative landscape. And it opens the way for a common-sense left-right agreement on an issue that has kept the parties apart for decades.

They are doing it in the U.S. They are reaching across the House. They are working on issues together.

It continues:

There is an urgent need to address the astronomical growth in the prison population, with its huge costs in dollars and lost human potential. We spent \$68 billion in 2010 on corrections – 300 percent more than 25 years ago. The prison population is growing 13 times faster than the general population. These facts should trouble every American.

Our prisons might be worth the current cost if the recidivism rate were not so high, but, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, half of the prisoners released this year are expected to be back in prison within three years. If our prison policies are failing half of the time, and we know that there are more humane, effective alternatives, it is time to [fundamentally] rethink how we treat and rehabilitate our prisoners.

We can no longer afford business as usual with prisons. The criminal justice system is broken, and conservatives must lead the way in fixing it.

Several states have shown that it is possible to cut costs while keeping the public safe. Consider events in Texas, which is known to be tough on crime. Conservative Republicans joined with Democrats in adopting incentive-based funding to strengthen the state's probation system in 2005. Then in 2007, they decided against building more prisons and instead opted to enhance proven community corrections approaches such as drug courts. The reforms are forecast to save \$2 billion in prison costs over five years.

• (1610)

Members will note that we are going to build more prisons.

It continues:

The Lone Star State has already redirected much of the money saved into community treatment for the mentally ill and low-level drug addicts. Not only have these reforms reduced Texas' prison population – helping to close the budget gap – but for the first time there is no waiting list for drug treatment in the state. And crime has dropped 10 percent from 2004, the year before the reforms, through 2009, according to the latest figures available, reaching its lowest annual rate since 1973.

Last year we both endorsed corrections reforms in South Carolina that will reserve costly prison beds for dangerous criminals while punishing low-risk offenders through lower-cost community supervision. The legislation was a bipartisan effort with strong support from liberals, conservatives, law enforcement, the judges and reform advocates. The state is expected to save \$175 million in prison construction this year and \$60 million in operating costs over the next several years.

Some people attribute the nation's recent drop in crime to more people being locked up. But the facts show otherwise. While crime fell in nearly every state over the past seven years, some of those with the largest reductions in crime have also lowered their prison population. Compare Florida and New York. Over the past seven years, Florida's incarceration rate has increased 16 percent, while New York's decreased 16 percent. Yet the crime rate in New York has fallen twice as much as Florida's. Put another way, although New York spent less on its prisons, it delivered better public safety.

Americans need to know that we can reform our prison systems to cost less and keep the public safe. We hope conservative leaders across the country will join with us in getting it right on crime.

I can barely believe I stood and read something written by Newt Gingrich. I am holding it forward as a sound public policy, but it is so much more sound than what the Conservative government is doing. It is absolutely remarkable to me.

Time and time again the NDP has stood in the House and said that it is not about being tough on crime; it is about being smart on crime. I have heard my colleague from Elmwood—Transcona many times say “smart on crime”. Our justice critic the member for Windsor—Tecumseh is always talking about smart on crime. Our public safety critic, the member for Vancouver Kingsway, talks about smart on crime. Here we have Newt Gingrich saying that we have to be right on crime. It is the same thing. It is unbelievable. He is right on crime.

I would like to go back to some of the testimony given at justice committee, particularly the testimony of Don Head. He talks about Correctional Service Canada and how it supports the judicial review process. He says that CSC supports the judicial review process that is governed by a particular directive. He says that 12 months before the offender's judicial review eligibility date, the institutional parole officer would meet with an offender to determine whether he or she was planning to submit an application. The staff would advise the offender at that time of his or her responsibility to actually engage with legal counsel. The staff of Correction Service Canada also works with the offender to facilitate a transfer to the jurisdiction where the hearing would be heard if the offender actually requests a move.

Next in the process is staff would advise the inmate to request access to his or her file through Access to Information so the information could be shared with legal counsel. Then the primary worker or the internal parole officer works to ensure that a psychiatric and/or a psychological assessment is completed in the 12 months leading up to the application as well as a judicial review report. That makes good sense to me.

The judicial review report follows the form that the department uses to determine parole eligibility and it covers six different areas: the offender's social, family and criminal background; sentence administration dates; summary of transfers and any disciplinary actions; summary of the offender's performance and conduct; any assessments done by psychiatrists, psychologists or elders; and finally, the offender's personal development.

Earlier I talked about these incentives, the faint hope clause being an incentive for good behaviour, but also being an incentive to actually engage with rehabilitation services. It is right there in the judicial review report. One wants to ensure that all the boxes are ticked, that there is a good record and that the required assessments have been completed. It makes perfect sense.

Government Orders

•(1615)

Another reason I bring up the actual process is to show that CSC works really hard to help determine whether an offender is a suitable candidate for parole. I have a copy of Don Head's testimony. When he testified in committee he said on the record, "As always, public safety is our paramount consideration". This is not just a matter of submitting an application online and an answer of yea or nay coming back. This is a lengthy, detailed and thoughtful process and as he said, public safety is of paramount consideration. He went on to say:

The offenders in our care all come from communities across this country, and most will return there. It is the job of Correctional Service of Canada to manage their sentence from the day they enter our facility through their incarceration and out into the community. And we do so with a constant eye to achieving good correctional results for Canada and Canadians.

When one hears about the process, one thinks this is achieving good correctional results for Canada and Canadians. When one hears about why the faint hope clause exists and the benefits it can give to the prison population as a whole, as well as to the workers in prisons, it makes good sense. It achieves good correctional results for Canada and Canadians. It is sound policy.

In 2005, Guy Bourgon from Corrections Research prepared a document on average time incarcerated for first degree murder convictions. In preparing this document, he asked the question: How long, in comparison to other countries, do offenders sentenced to first degree murder in Canada spend incarcerated? That is a really great question.

Clearly, if the government is introducing this piece of legislation, Bill S-6, then it must think that something is wrong, that something must be broken. It is a great question. Maybe the case is that in Canada people are being let out way too early and in other countries offenders are staying in prison much longer. It is a good question to explore. I will flip to the answer that he discovered.

This went to committee from Mr. Sapers. In the first part, he looked at some research by Andrew Harris in 1999 and found that in Canada the accountability and performance measurement sector of Correctional Service Canada. It reported that offenders serving time for a first degree murder conviction spent, on average, 28.4 years incarcerated.

In contrast, 16 other countries around the world were surveyed for the same first degree murder charge or its equivalent and those who were eligible for release. Those who were sentenced to death or offenders sentenced to life without parole were excluded. They spent an average of 14.3 years incarcerated. Only Japan, Austria and the U.S.A. have offenders serving life sentences without parole in reported averages of 20 years or longer.

It is not even that we in Canada are way behind the rest of the world when it comes to sentencing for first degree murder. In fact, in Japan it was 21.5 years, Austria was 20 years and the U.S.A. was 29 years. We are at 28.4 years. We are behind the U.S.A. by just a few months. It is crazy when we think about it that way.

We know that we are not wildly out of sync with other countries around the world when it comes to our sentencing provisions. We know this is something that works. It keeps our workers safe in prisons. It gives people incentives to try to rehabilitate. It keeps our communities safer in the long run.

I urge all members of the House to reject what it is that Bill S-6 is trying to do.

•(1620)

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member made an excellent speech on Bill S-6. Her commentary about the article written by Newt Gingrich and Pat Nolan should be required reading for all members of the House, particularly those on the government side. When I read the article, I thought Newt Gingrich had stolen my speech because we are practically in lockstep. I never thought I would ever see the day when that would happen.

If members read the article, they would see that he is taking a realistic approach to the problem. He is crossing party lines. He is working with Democrats to arrive at best practices. That is something we should all be trying to achieve regarding any aspect of spending money. We should be looking at what works and best practices, which is what the Americans are doing. After the Reagan administration, they have realized that the 25 years of "three strikes and you are out" has not worked. Jails are full of people and the crime rate is going up. Now they are looking at best case scenarios and reducing the prison populations in many states, reducing costs and getting results. That is what we should be doing in Canada. It is painfully obvious.

The member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue is very upset that he has lost the Liberal Party. The Liberal members are looking at short-term gain. They are worried about an election happening in a few months and are going to follow the Conservative Party to eliminate this bill. That is straightforward. However, all the evidence south of the border proves we should be looking at it in a different light.

•(1625)

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Speaker, I share the member's amazement with the Newt Gingrich piece. It makes perfect sense.

When we hear testimony at committee about what works and what does not work, often we know it does not work because we actually look at the experience in the U.S. Certain states have done everything wrong on different issues. I suppose it is useful. We can look at it to say that it does not work, that in fact crime rates do not go down, that it does not make sense that there is an increase in rehabilitation.

The faint hope clause does encourage rehabilitation. That is what we are here for. Because we live in a just society, it breaks my heart to think that some of my colleagues in the Liberal Party are going to support Bill S-6 because it is the political thing to do. This is an absolutely unjust bill. I think of Gandhi who said that an eye for an eye makes the whole world blind. What we are doing here is punishing for punishment's sake. It does not make good sense and it is unjust.

Government Orders

Mr. Jim Maloway: Mr. Speaker, when one considers it, at the end of the day, through this long, rigorous process that must be followed, only 1% or 2% would ever get out under the system. However, potentially 100% of the prisoners would behave themselves because of the belief that they might eventually be one of that 1% or 2%. To me it is a small price to pay, giving those people a semblance of hope to encourage them to stay out of trouble and engage in rehabilitation, which is what we want them to do. We must ensure that these prisoners are not a danger to others in the prisons nor a danger to the guards. I do not see anything wrong with the idea that somehow 100% of the prisoners will do the right thing, rehabilitate and behave themselves in the hope that they may be part of that 1% that gets out at the end of the day. That is obviously what the member for Winnipeg North's former leader, Pierre Trudeau, was thinking of when this legislation was dealt with. However, for short-term expediency, the Liberals have jumped on the Conservative bandwagon in fear when they should be looking at what is going on in other parts of the world, such as the United States.

It is interesting to note that Newt Gingrich and the NDP have aligned and the Liberals, not surprisingly of course, are following the Conservatives on this particular issue.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Speaker, the member for Elmwood—Transcona has been here throughout the whole debate. He knows a lot about this issue and is very passionate about it.

One thing we forget is that in Canada a life sentence is a sentence for life. Even those offenders who are released into the community after they have served their time in prison are supervised until the time of their death. It is a life sentence.

When it comes to time served in prison, the average time served in prison for first degree murder in Canada is 28.4 years. That is one of the longest average times in the world. In comparison, the U.S. average time incarcerated is 23 years. In New Zealand, Scotland, Switzerland and England, the average time spent is under 15 years.

We are taking it seriously in Canada. There are many good, sound public policy reasons for keeping the faint hope clause.

We have to remember history. We have to remember the past. The faint hope clause was tied to the abolition of capital punishment and the concept that individual offenders are capable of change and rehabilitation. It is the just thing to do to stand up in the House and reject this proposition and to reject Bill S-6.

● (1630)

Mr. Jim Maloway: Mr. Speaker, I think I am the next speaker on the bill in any event, so we will get to some other issues.

I would like to query the member about how this bill fits in with the Conservative election strategy. We have a number of boutique bills that cover issues that are already covered under the Criminal Code. As a matter of fact, the whole issue should be for us to revamp the entire Criminal Code, but that is not something in which the Conservatives want to be engaged.

We had a situation recently where the Conservatives discovered that Clifford Olson was receiving an old age pension in prison. They acted immediately to bring in legislation. When we looked into who started sending pension cheques to federal prisoners in the first place, we found that it was none other than Joe Clark's Conservative

government in 1979, I believe it was. I have had the date wrong a couple of times already so I want to make sure that I am correct on that.

There is silence from the Conservatives, because they would never want to admit to their base that they were the ones who brought in that legislation. Don Mazankowski and other Conservatives were licking stamps, putting them on envelopes and mailing pension cheques to prisoners. They are the people who started it, but the Conservatives have to pretend that it was some sort of Liberal conspiracy. That is one they could not pin on the Liberals.

I have not yet heard a Liberal try to make the point that it was the Conservatives who started this process. We should give them credit in that they are helping correct it, but they should take responsibility for starting something they should not have started in the first place.

Ms. Megan Leslie: Mr. Speaker, yes, absolutely.

I do not really have much to add to what the member for Elmwood—Transcona said. I think he said it beautifully.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Barry Devolin): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for London—Fanshawe, Status of Women; the hon. member for Québec, Contaminated Water in Shannon; the hon. member for Laval—Les Îles, Census.

[*English*]

Resuming debate, the hon. member for Elmwood—Transcona.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be back after the so-called Christmas break. I have to say, it was not much of a break. I spent the last month and a half doing a lot of work in the constituency and participated in 11 tea parties. I am sure that many members were doing the same thing over the Christmas break; actively involved and probably working as hard or harder as sometimes we do here in Ottawa. I want to counter the impression the media have suggested in that the MPs are now back from a month and a half break. Some relaxing month a half break it was. I am sure many MPs were in the same boat that I was.

In dealing with Bill S-6, we are now at third reading. It has gone through committee, the amendment stage and I think the bill is likely to pass at the end of the day with support. I believe the Liberals and the government will put this legislation through. Whether it will make it through the Senate quickly enough to become law before the next election is a separate issue.

The fact of the matter is that speaker after speaker, particularly from the Bloc and NDP, have pointed out the history of the faint hope clause. The Conservatives like to misrepresent it, particularly with the media, and pretend that somehow it is an evil piece of legislation that needs to be eliminated. They do not ever get around to explaining to the public why it came into place initially and what the benefits of it are.

Other speakers have indicated how long, involved and complicated this process is. If I have enough time I will get into that later, but it is very involved and I think very few prisoners actually apply for it.

As I indicated before, in some ways it is a small price to pay for getting the co-operation of the prisoners. Right now if we throw them away in custody for 28.4 years, which is longer than most other countries, with absolutely no hope of any chance to get out, where is the incentive for them to take rehabilitation programs? Why would there be any incentive for them to behave themselves while they are there?

I do not think the public needs the promotion of prison riots, violence in prison, or inmates refusing to rehabilitate themselves. That is not what we want. If we can get 100% of the prisoners to behave themselves for long periods of time and take rehabilitation, knowing full well that at the end of the day there is only a 1% chance that any of them will ever be released, that is probably a very good approach and good idea.

Once again, we are looking for best practices and ideas that work regardless of the party, regardless of the jurisdiction or country that it takes place in. We should be trying to save the taxpayers of Canada and give them as efficient a government as possible.

The Conservatives are now talking about \$9 billion in new prison developments and expansions, and the public are onside and say, "Absolutely, bring it on, get tough with those criminals and build more prisons". However, it should be explained that costs would go up astronomically under some of these pieces of legislation the Conservatives are proposing to bring in. It is going to cost the taxpayers \$9 billion for prisons. It is going to cost the provinces because a lot of these costs are going to be borne by the provinces. It is going to cost the taxpayer, and there is only one taxpayer, as the Conservatives often point out to us.

• (1635)

That is a different picture. It looks a little different to taxpayers when they see that. They see that Canada is going to build more prisons and is going to operate on the basis of "three strikes and you're out", which has been proven not to work in the United States over the last 25 years, but we are going to adopt that model. The prisons are going to be filled with these prisoners and it is going to make us feel good for a while, but at the end of the day, it is going to cost \$9 billion to build the prisons, and in perpetuity it is going to cost enormous amounts to keep people warehoused in prisons. That is what has happened in the United States.

That is why we have jurisdictions in the United States like California that are practically bankrupting themselves and are now coming to grips with the issue of overcrowded prisons that they cannot afford to run anymore. That is why we have the shocking revelation that none other than Newt Gingrich and Pat Nolan have joined forces to try to move the right in the United States on a more sensible path.

I never thought I would see the day when I would be supporting Newt Gingrich. When I read his communiqué and see that it is pretty close to some of the speeches I have made, I would normally be

Government Orders

scared about that. However in this particular case, I think what Newt Gingrich is proposing makes eminent sense.

I want to read some parts of the letter. It should be required reading for all of us. I would be surprised if anyone, even on the Conservative side, disagreed with anything he has had to say in this recent communiqué of January 7, 2011. He says:

With nearly all 50 states facing budget deficits, it's time to end business as usual in state capitols and for legislators to think and act with courage and creativity. We urge conservative legislators to lead the way in addressing an issue often considered off-limits to reform: prisons. Several states have recently shown that they can save on costs without compromising public safety by intelligently reducing their prison populations.

I hope everyone is with me so far because it certainly sounds reasonable to me.

He goes on:

We joined with other conservative leaders last month to announce the Right on Crime Campaign, a national movement urging states to make sensible and proven reforms to our criminal justice system - policies that will cut prison costs while keeping the public safe. Among the prominent signatories are Reagan administration attorney general Ed Meese...We all agree that we can keep the public safe while spending fewer tax dollars if we spend them more effectively.

Why would any member of the Conservative caucus have a problem with this, up to this point? He continues:

The Right on Crime Campaign represents a seismic shift in the legislative landscape. And it opens the way for a common-sense left-right agreement on an issue that has kept the parties apart for decades. There is an urgent need to address the astronomical growth in the prison population, with its huge costs in dollars and lost human potential. We spent \$68 billion in 2010 on corrections - 300 percent more than 25 years ago. The prison population is growing 13 times faster than the general population. These facts should trouble every American.

He goes on to say: "Our prisons might be worth the current cost if the recidivism rate were not so high".

I can agree with that. He goes on: "...but, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, half of the prisoners released this year are expected to be back in prison within three years". This is proof that the current system does not work. He continues:

If our prison policies are failing half of the time, and we know that there are more humane, effective alternatives, it is time to fundamentally rethink how we treat and rehabilitate our prisoners.

• (1640)

It is time to fundamentally rethink how we treat and rehabilitate our prisoners. We can no longer afford business as usual with prisons.

That is an admission that the Reagan administration made a serious mistake. Maybe it made sense to a lot of people at that time, and it was popular at that time, but through the last 25 years we can look back and see that we are not getting the results that we wanted to have.

The criminal justice system is broken and he says that Conservatives must lead the way in fixing it. Several states have shown that it is possible to cut the costs while keeping the public safe. Is that not what we all want?

Government Orders

Consider events in Texas, which is known as a tough on crime state. Conservative Republicans joined with Democrats in adopting incentive-based funding to strengthen the state's probation system in 2005. Then in 2007 they decided against building more prisons, unlike our government which will build \$9 billion worth of new prisons. They stopped building more prisons. Instead, they opted to enhance proven community corrections approaches such as drug courts.

We know that we have drug courts here in Canada and the evidence shows that they work reasonably well. That is what they are looking at in Texas. Once again, we should be able to compare notes and realize that if a system works here and works there, it must be a good idea.

The reforms are forecast to save \$2 billion in prison costs over five years, because as I have mentioned before, we know that when we lock in \$9 billion in prison construction, take all the fixed costs associated with keeping all these prisoners we will have in there, where will it end? We will have no end in sight, and then 10 or 15 years from now, we will try to dismantle the system that is not working when we knew at the beginning that it would not work.

He goes on to say: "The Lone Star State has already redirected much of the money saved into community treatment for the mentally ill and low-level drug addicts."

Once again, a recognition of something we already know here. Not only have these reforms reduced the prison population of Texas, helping to close the state budget gap, but for the first time there is no waiting list for drug treatment in the state, and the crime rate has dropped 10% from 2004, the year before the reforms.

These reforms did not just happen this year. They have been in effect now for five years. Why is the government not sending a task force down to Texas to check up on this stuff? Why are we not hearing speeches from the opposite side about what they discovered on their trip to Texas? Why are the Conservatives not looking at doing that? The simple answer is that what Conservatives are doing is what they think is selling to the public. That is what it is really all about. It is not about results, saving money and giving the taxpayers value for dollars spent, which is what we would want, and finding out what Texas is doing and implementing it here. No, it is all about what does the focus group say about the current crime measure before us on a particular day. We have a new one almost every day.

The crime rate dropped 10% from 2004, and according to the latest figures available, it reached its lowest annual rate since 1973. That is a rather important statistic. He also said:

Last year we both endorsed corrections reforms in South Carolina that will reserve costly prison beds for dangerous criminals while punishing low-risk offenders through lower-cost community supervision. That is a very sensible thing to do.

However, what does the government want to do? It wants to throw these low risk offenders into the \$9 billion worth of prisons it is constructing.

He also says: "The legislation was a bipartisan effort with strong support from liberals, conservatives, law enforcement, the judges and reform advocates".

Speaking about South Carolina, he says: "The state is expected to save \$175 million in prison construction this year and \$60 million in operating costs over the next several years".

• (1645)

It is those operating costs that are really debilitating to our treasury. When we should be spending the money on health care and other productive things in society, we are fixing ourselves in cement by indicating that we will have operating costs for many years to come when we fill the prisons with people.

He goes on to say:

Some people attribute the nation's recent drop in crime to more people being locked up. But the facts show otherwise. While crime fell in nearly every state over the past seven years, some of those with the largest reductions in crime have also lowered their prison population. Over the past seven years, Florida's incarceration rate has increased 16 percent, while New York's decreased 16 percent. Yet the crime rate in New York has fallen twice as much as Florida's. Put another way, although New York spent less on its prisons, it delivered better public safety.

Once again, that is something that we want to support.

He goes on to say:

Americans need to know that we can reform our prison systems to cost less and keep the public safe. We hope conservative leaders across the country will join with us in getting it right on crime.

I guess his message is not going anywhere in Canada with the federal Conservatives or Conservatives elsewhere in the country because we do not see a recognition of what the problem is and how it can be solved.

I would like the people who are watching CPAC to know that Newt Gingrich was the speaker of the house when Bill Clinton was president, so it goes back a little way. Newt Gingrich wanted to run for president himself but he was speaker of the house from 1995 to 1999 and is the founder of American Solutions. Patrick Nolan was the Republican leader of the California State Assembly. There are some very high level people in the United States doing a total about-face on this issue. It could not have come at a better time in terms of our assessment of this bill and others in the House.

Government Orders

When the member for Winnipeg North made a speech earlier in the day, I asked him a question. We are from the same province and are trying to deal with issues that work in certain areas. We know that our home province of Manitoba is practically the only province in the country that has been able to get a handle on auto theft and has reduced the rate of auto theft by 80% in the last five years. That is an astounding result.

Manitoba also has new legislation on the seizure of goods obtained by crime. The Hells Angels' clubhouse was recently seized in Winnipeg and I am told that in the last few months 21 more houses in Winnipeg have been seized, for a total value of \$9 million, which has taken the money out of crime, which is why criminals are in prison.

Before the RICO law in the United States, criminals were quite willing to go to prison for a couple of years because they knew that once they were released they could access millions of dollars that were hidden in banks. Now the money, the bank accounts, the houses, the cars and the grow-ops of the Hells Angels are being seized. Where is the reward in criminal activity when those things are gone?

That is the type of activity Canada should be advocating. It is the NDP government in Manitoba that has taken those two initiatives that are achieving results. We just wish the federal government could show the same kind of initiative and results. The federal government is being outshone by a provincial government when it should be showing leadership, following best practices and taking the advice of its own seatmate, Newt Gingrich, in the United States.

I see the member for Kings—Hants taking notes. He is certainly aware of Newt Gingrich. He would probably want to read Newt's latest tome. I am sure he would be very impressed with what he has written.

• (1650)

Mr. John Rafferty (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, what is happening here is that the government simply wants to build more beds in prisons and build bigger prisons because it knows that it appeals to a small part of its base but it does not make any dollars and sense. Aside from no sense, it makes no dollars and cents.

Given that it costs \$343,810 to keep one woman in a federal prison for one year, does my colleague think it makes sense to build more prisons and put in more beds rather than giving people the opportunity to rehabilitate or deal with problems in a preventive way in terms of having supports in place for people who have a mental illness?

Mr. Jim Maloway: Mr. Speaker, I think Newt Gingrich and other conservatives in the United States have recognized that the program is unsustainable primarily because it does not get results at the end of the day.

The government will have some short-term advantage with the public because the public will agree to the building of prisons, but it is not looking at the \$9 billion associated with building them and, as the member pointed out, the fact that it costs \$343,000 a year to keep one person in prison without showing results.

We need to start getting smart on crime but the Conservative government is not showing a lot of signs of that at this point.

I pointed out earlier that on the day the Conservatives found out that Clifford Olson was getting a retirement pension, they introduced legislation to eliminate it. However, when we checked into it, we found out that it was the Conservative government of Joe Clark that started mailing pension cheques out to prisoners in the first place.

A lot of things need correcting in this system, and that was one of them and it was corrected, but the Conservatives did not admit that it was their problem in the first place. They did not admit that they were the ones who started sending pension cheques to prisoners in the first place. I just get total silence from that side when this issue comes up.

• (1655)

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one of the things we have not seen from the government is a follow through on programs and services for youth.

Prior to coming to this chamber, I worked at the multicultural council with youth at risk. We ran an important summer program that gave youth the opportunity to learn skills and get engaged with the community. We had over a 90% success rate of youth either going back to school or finding employment.

It is also important to note that the government has changed some of the actual programs to make it more difficult to acquire funding. One in particular that was sadly lost was the new beginnings project where counsellor Bill Marra and the executive director of new beginnings and his staff did a terrific job on a garden project. During the summer, youth at risk would learn gardening skills and provide food for the community. However, the government made the program so difficult that it has disappeared.

Just recently, our summer employment bank was also reduced in terms of funding. Around \$4,000 to \$5,000 has been cut from Windsor West so more youth will not get employed. Our youth unemployment rate is 20%. It is critical to have these types of programs in place so young people can get the opportunity to learn skills and further their education and experience because they will be applying it in the field.

We had a press conference, along with the presidents of the University of Windsor and St. Clair College, the student unions and a youth activist group, to bring this issue forward.

I would ask my colleague about the fact that not enough preventive work is being done and that only a small amount of money is necessary to get youth to make other decisions. If we provide them with a choice, they will make the right choice for the most part.

Mr. Jim Maloway: Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, the government announced that it would not renew the funding after either March 1 or April 1 for three anti-gang programs that it had set up across the country approximately three years ago.

Government Orders

We have a government that decided to set up three anti-gang programs at multiple locations across the country to keep young people away from gangs and away from crime and then, after three years, it wants to cut their funding completely and shut these programs down when the programs, evidently, have shown to have benefits and are solid programs. That is not an example of a government that is smart on crime, in any sense of the word.

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member for Elmwood—Transcona has been very articulate and outstanding in this Parliament in pointing out the differences and the contradictions between what the Conservatives say and what they actually do.

Here we have a situation where there have been massive cutbacks in crime prevention programs and massive cutbacks in addiction programs. In short, there have been massive cutbacks in every sector that actually works to reduce crime.

Given the Conservatives' track record and given all these things that they have cut back on that actually helped to bring the crime rate down, does the member not think that the real objective of the Conservative government is very juvenile partisan gamesmanship, that rather than actually doing the concrete things that reduce crime and that work in communities, they want to stoke some kind of political fire to obtain some kind of cheap partisan political advantage from what they should be taking seriously?

• (1700)

Mr. Jim Maloway: Mr. Speaker, we need look no further than the prison farm program. We had six prison farms in this country for many years in Kingston and in Winnipeg where prisoners would get up at six in the morning and work with animals producing milk and other farm commodities. The government just shut down the farms when it should have been doubling them, taking the number of farms from six to twelve, or maybe even more, and expanding them. However, it shut them down at cost to the economy for the farmers around Kingston who used the abattoir in Kingston. There are dairy herds in Winnipeg and in Kingston that have been sold off. The land is being sold off. When I tell Conservative voters what the current government has done to the prison farms, they shake their heads.

This is an issue that even the government's own supporters cannot understand. The Conservatives are basically looking to the next election. Their whole vision is to lurch from crisis to crisis and to wonder how the issue will look in a focus group and how it will help them in the next election to get a majority government. They want to forget about the long-term consequences and the long-term costs that have been clearly demonstrated in the United States and recently commented on by Newt Gingrich.

They want to spend \$9 billion to develop prisons to house prisoners when they say that the crime rate is actually dropping and then there will be the ongoing costs of keeping these prisoners, which, as the member for Thunder Bay—Rainy River pointed out, is about \$300,000 a year per prisoner, when they should continue to fund the anti-gang programs that they started three years ago. They should also have addiction programs and rehabilitative programs. They should actually start following Newt Gingrich, to be honest, to achieve results.

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to follow my colleague, the member for Elmwood—Transcona. Earlier in the day, the member for Halifax and the member for Windsor—Tecumseh spoke to the bill.

It is interesting to note that the Conservatives cannot even rise in the House to defend the bill. The criticisms that have been brought on Bill S-6 have been so sharp and so clear that they do not have answers. The justice minister made his little partisan attempt earlier this afternoon, but it is very clear that the Conservatives know they do not have very much substance backing up the bill.

To start, we need to talk about what the history has been around Bill S-6. This is now the umpteenth time in the House of Commons that we are negotiating the same bill and having these discussions and debates around it.

Why has the bill come back yet again? As we well know, it is for one simple reason. What the government has done systematically with its justice legislation, some of which was good but mostly bad, is every time it moves in the House of Commons, it moves to prorogue the House of Commons and then starts the bills over again. Then the Conservatives have the audacity to come into the House and say something about the opposition not agreeing with or slowing down their agenda. What we have seen every time is the Conservative government stopping the Conservative agenda. For the umpteenth time now the bill is back.

In the cost of debates, prorogations and bringing this back, countless dollars in taxpayer money have been spent on the bill. It begs the question of why the Conservatives are bringing this forward so often every time they prorogue Parliament. It is a despicable act, given the importance of moving forward as a country and as a democratic government moving forward, having debates, deciding which legislation is good and which legislation is bad. That is an extremely important role in democracy.

As we well know, we see countries in North Africa where people literally die trying to obtain that quest for democracy, that desire to have what we have here. The forum for democratic debate is absolutely essential.

We have a democratically elected Parliament that is systematically prorogued by the government and a prime minister who tends to treat Parliament as his own personal play thing. Therefore, the government has brought the bill back.

When we look at the due regard of the impact of the Bill S-6, we have to look no further than the testimony of Don Head, Commissioner of Correctional Service Canada, before the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights on November 16, 2010. This testimony is freely available to every member of Parliament to look at the actual impact of the bill that the government keeps stubbornly bringing back.

On November 16, Mr. Head said, "Historically, since the first judicial review hearing in 1987, there have been a total of 181 court decisions". Therefore, over the last 25 years, there have been 181 court decisions. This bill would obviously have an impact on that.

He went on to say:

Government Orders

Of these cases, 146 of the court decisions resulted in a reduction of the period that must be served before parole eligibility, and 35 resulted in a refusal.

Of the 146 offenders who have had their parole eligibility dates moved earlier, 144 have now reached their revised day parole eligibility date and 135 have been granted parole. Of these 135 offenders, 68, or about half, had no issue during supervision; 35 received a suspension but were not subsequently revoked; and 23 had their parole revoked. Seven of the 135 reoffended in a non-violent manner and two reoffended violently.

● (1705)

Over the last quarter century, out of the hundreds of persons who might have been eligible, as we work through the process, we find that many of them were rejected, some were granted parole and some, for parole violations, had their parole revoked. Only seven reoffended in a non-violent manner. Two reoffended violently.

I will finish the quotation from Mr. Head because it is very relevant to Bill S-6 and what has been brought forward today. He said:

Of the two offenders who reoffended violently, one was found guilty of two counts of assault with a weapon and one count of assault use of force, and the other offender was found guilty of one count of robbery.

This is a very important preamble to the debate we are having today. We are talking about the government being concerned about violations over a period of a quarter century that resulted in exactly one assault and one robbery. There is an inordinate amount of time brought forward on the bill for an issue that has essentially resulted in one assault and one robbery. While we deplore the assault and robbery on those victims, the reality is the other actions of the government have had a manifold negative impact on increasing crime rates far beyond the characteristics of the bill.

Let us take a moment and look at what the government has done since it has been in power.

We are talking about Bill S-6 and the net impact, if it had not been so poorly drafted. As usual, the government, as we have certainly seen in trade policy, most recently with the softwood lumber sell-out, did not do its due diligence. Softwood lumber communities across the country paid the price with another \$60 million fine levied a few days ago and millions of dollars now in potential fines coming forward because the government simply did not do its work on the softwood lumber. The government has not done its work on Bill S-6 and even if it had, we are talking about an issue that over a quarter of a century resulted in one assault and one robbery.

As deplorable as those two acts were, the government's intent and actions in gutting crime prevention programs have had far worse of an impact.

Let us look at the impact of what the government has done since it came to power, the so-called anti-crime government. It has slashed crime prevention programs by more than half. It has gutted the programs that actually reduce the number of victims in society. Yet, instead of doing anything to increase crime prevention, which the NDP would support fully, the government has gutted those programs. The NDP has stood strongly in the House to say that this was fundamentally wrong.

Every dollar spent on crime prevention programs saves six dollars later on in policing costs, courts costs and prison costs. Why would

the government not beef up the crime prevention funding? That is certainly what Canadians want to see.

On the crime prevention front, Canadians want to see lower crime rates and crime prevention investment taking place because it is cost effective and it means eliminating victims. There are no victims when the crime is prevented in the first place. The government slashed those programs and is now bringing in this legislation. It is trumpeting how effective it wants to be on crime when the impact, over a quarter of a century, has been one robbery and one assault.

The government has cut back on addiction programs. I will come back a little later to what even Republicans in the United States are saying, and Newt Gingrich was quoted earlier. Republicans in the United States have come around to the fact that they have to beef up funding for addiction programs to bring down the crime rate. What has the Conservative government done? Exactly the opposite.

Just a few scant weeks before the government came to power, the NDP brought forward a private member's bill. I was in the House when that vote was held and there were police officers and firefighters in the gallery. The legislation was for a public safety officer compensation fund. Conservatives at the time voted for that legislation. Firefighters, police officers and their families were very happy with that.

● (1710)

As we know, in many parts of the country firefighters and police officers are not covered by provincial or municipal plans. There is no insurance, which means if they die in the line of duty, if they die protecting Canadians, their families get nothing. Their families have to sell their houses.

I have spoken with spouses of firefighters and police officers who have had to take on second and third jobs to try to keep a roof over their heads, whose kids have had to give up on schooling, kids whose parents, father or mother, a public safety officer, or a police officer or a firefighter, died in the line of duty and there was nothing to compensate the family.

In the United States every one of those public safety officer deaths is compensated. There is insurance so the family can keep a roof over their heads. Families can mourn and go on with their lives, at least knowing they do not have to work every day to keep the wolf of indebtedness away from the door.

Government Orders

The Conservative government, elected scant weeks after that legislation was adopted by Parliament, has for five years steadfastly refused to provide compensation to police officers and firefighters in our country. If there is another reason for Conservative supporters to be ashamed, it is this; that the Conservatives would show such reckless disregard and disrespect for our public safety officers, our police officers and firefighters, who die in the line of the duty. The government has done absolutely nothing. It is sickening and deplorable.

For the government to pretend that it is somehow on the side of police officers, it is the height of hypocrisy. It has done even more than that. Before the Conservatives came to government, they made commitments to put community police officers on the streets right across the country. They have had five long years and have had ample opportunity to take action. Rather than bringing bills like Bill S-6 forward, they could have taken action in this regard.

Community policing is the most effective anti-crime strategy possible. Couple that with effective crime prevention policies and addiction treatment programs, we would have an overall strategy that would be remarkably effective.

What have the Conservatives done? They did not keep their promise. As my colleague, the member for Elmwood—Transcona mentioned a few moments ago, the government gutted the prison agricultural program, which was very effective in providing that transition for inmates back into civil society.

On the anti-crime front, the government has a lamentable and deplorable record. What it chooses to do is bring forward Bill S-6, after destroying the infrastructure that is providing for crime prevention and reducing the number of victims.

If the Conservatives continue to agitate for an election, putting those attack ads up across the country, wanting to go to an election right away, the only thing I would say is that given the Conservative record on crime, they better watch it. If the Conservatives want an election so eagerly, they will have to stand on their record. The Conservative record on crime prevention, the cutbacks to addiction programs, the disrespect for police officers and firefighters and the broken promises on providing community policing, is even worse than the previous Liberal government.

That is what the government has done on the crime front.

I want to mention a couple of other aspects that contrast vividly with Bill S-6, a bill that the government continues to bring back every time it prorogues the House because it says it is anti-crime.

Canadians are also aware of two other things that the Conservative government has done in the last few months. First, with respect to that murderous regime in Colombia, the secret police and the army, guilty of the deaths of dozens and dozens of people, labour activists, human rights advocates, the government chose to sign a preferential trade agreement. The government gave it preferential trade status. In other words, it whitewashed all the deaths. It did not in any way say that Colombia had to clean up its act and stop the secret police, the army and the paramilitaries from massacring civilians.

The Conservatives said that they would give Colombia a stamp of approval. It did not matter how many people were murdered, Canada

would give Colombia a preferential trade agreement. It was absolutely despicable and hypocritical.

Across the length and breadth of this land, people see that difference. They do not see it as logical that a murder taking place in Colombia is all right and that the government is somehow being tough on crime in Canada.

● (1715)

Canadians are very principled people. Whether on the South Shore—St. Margarets, or in northern Alberta and Edmonton, they understand the distinction that a regime whose secret police and paramilitaries and militaries are guilty of murder should not be given a reward for having committed those crimes.

Then, of course, just a few months ago, we had this government bring forward other legislation. As we know, the IRS and the American state department have deplored the laundering of drug money in Panama by illegal drug gangs. What did the government do? Again, it gave Panama a stamp of approval and has put in place a trade agreement the NDP is sharply opposed to, allowing for more cover ups of the money laundering and tax evasion that takes place in Panama. There is no tax information agreement in place. The government requested it in a weak way. At this point in time, to put that trade agreement in place is fueling the laundering of dirty drug money in Panama today.

Here is the contradiction. After having prorogued a couple of times, this government comes forward yet again with this bill stating that it wants to be tough on crime. If we look through the statistics of the Correctional Service of Canada, we see that what it is actually talking about is one act of assault and one act of robbery over 25 years. Then we see what the government actually does. The government talks a good line; it does not walk its talk. What it does is to gut the programs that actually contribute to public safety.

Following me will be the member for Vancouver Kingsway, who is going to talk about the youth gang program the Conservatives have just gutted again, yet another public safety program, yet another crime prevention program, which stops crimes before they are committed. And what does the government do? It stops it.

That brings us back to the fundamental question: why is this bill being brought forward? That is the crux of the debate here today. It is not about crime; it is about the partisan, juvenile posturing the government has become renowned for. After five years in power, it still has no opportunity to get a majority government. That is because of its juvenile posturing on these important issues. When we look at its fiscal management and its record deficit and the appallingly misspent or misallocated money, the tens of billions of dollars for corporate tax cuts, and at the economy and government's throwing away of 600,000 well paying full-time jobs and its replacement of them with 400,000 low paying part-time jobs, and it then coming into the House and saying, this is a triumph, these are the contradictions that Canadians see. Canadians do not like these contradictions and the inability of the government to walk the talk.

Government Orders

Then we get to the crime file and we see in case after case, whether it is rewarding bad or murderous regimes, cutting back on the prison farm program, not keeping its promise on community policing, not showing respect and providing support for families who have lost a police officer or a firefighter family member by providing for the public safety officers compensation fund this House voted on five and a half years ago, and then the cutbacks to crime prevention and youth gang programs, to addiction programs, all of which have an impact on reducing the crime rate, these are the contradictions that Canadians see more and more. These are the contradictions that Canadians deplore. Yet this government is revving its motors, putting on its attack ads and its smear campaign in full bore to go for an election right now. It is very clear that it wants an election: devil the people, devil the Canadians.

• (1720)

Conservatives are saying they do not want to get stuff done, that all they want to do is to have partisan attacks, smear campaigns and to run attack ads everywhere they can. But Canadians want something different. They want a real crime strategy, a smart on crime strategy that prevents crimes before they are committed. They want to make sure that the funding is in place for youth gang strategy, and they want an effective, smart on crime strategy that actually—

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments, the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade.

Mr. Gerald Keddy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to the hon. member. I had some difficulty following his train of thought. He jumped around a lot and he really used a lot of examples and analogies that had nothing to do with this particular piece of legislation, but I would ask a pretty straightforward question.

I have heard the hon. member talk a lot about what Canadians like or do not like, so I am assuming he has spoken to most Canadians on the issue of crime. However, the real issue here is that Canadians want to feel safe and secure in their homes, on the streets, in their workplaces. That is not an unreasonable thought, and it should not be foreign even to the NDP's mindset. However, the NDP does not support legislation that enforces that.

My question to the hon. member is, does he intend to support Conservative legislation that actually forces criminals to serve their time in prison, or not? It is a simple question, yes or no?

• (1725)

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, I will say this to the member: What the NDP has been pushing for is the kinds of programs that reduce crime. If the member for South Shore—St. Margaret's thinks that Canadians support the Conservatives' gutting of crime prevention programs, I think he will have a rude awakening come this election the Conservatives are pushing for.

What Canadians want to see is crime prevention programs put into place. They want to see the Conservatives keep their promise for community policing. Canadians want to see the kinds of addiction programs that bring down the crime rate.

The Republicans in the United States are saying that the NDP is right on these crime issues, that what the Conservatives have done is

a wrong approach, that they are wrong to cut back on crime prevention and addiction programs. If the Republicans in the United States can say the NDP has been right all along on a smart on crime strategy, I guess it begs the question, on what planet are the Conservatives if even Republicans can understand the simple concept that when we put crime strategies in place, we spend less money and we have fewer victims? I guess the question is, why are the Conservatives offside of every other civilized country and even their own right-wing parties in other countries, who have come to the realization that we have to put in place the supports and the crime prevention strategy before the crime happens?

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as I noted earlier in the debate, the Conservatives have cut back on the summer employment programs for youth in my area of Windsor West, where they cut thousands of dollars. What that means is that more youth will not find employment.

We have an unemployment rate of 20%. I have worked directly with youth at risk. One of the most important things we can do is to ensure their training and schooling and that they actually have employment during the summer.

It is interesting, because this is the government that talks about its fiscal record, and just the other day, it spent another \$650,000 on a vase made by an American.

We have to wonder about the priorities of the Conservatives when the people who are on the streets right now, the youth who are actually spending record amounts of money and getting into debt to go to school, have no opportunities. It is not only important that they actually make some money, but also that it keeps them out of trouble and gives them hope and opportunity. It is also important for the Canadian economy for productivity, because if they get into their field of study, they are getting experience and we are not losing them to the United States or other jurisdictions because there are no jobs and they have no experience.

I would like to ask the member for Burnaby—New Westminster about choices like these. In his riding, is he seeing the youth being left behind? Will that cause a problem in the future? I just cannot believe the government could buy a vase for \$650,000, but does not have enough money for one of the regions with highest youth unemployment rate, my riding, which has 20% youth unemployment? Where are its priorities?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, the member for Windsor West is absolutely right. Before I was elected to Parliament, I was a financial administrator. As it is with most New Democrats, the way ordinary Canadians manage their households is by being careful to spend money on the essentials. That is why one wants to put a budget in the hands of ordinary Canadians to be managed best, not by the high-flying, elite Conservatives, and certainly not by what we saw from the Liberals in the past. It is simply a matter of making the crucial decision the way Canadian families do every day and putting the money into essentials.

Government Orders

A \$650,000 vase is not an essential and nor is it a priority to have \$2 billion for a 72-hour meeting, because the Prime Minister got carried away and decided to build fake lakes here and cover over other lakes there, and nor are the tens of billions of dollars shovelled out the back of a truck for corporate tax cuts.

That money is going offshore because the Conservatives have not even put any valuation mechanism in place for them to know whether the money is actually being used for job creation. That is why 600,000 full-time jobs were lost and we got back 400,000 part-time, low-paying jobs, and yet they say it is a wonderful thing. They lost 200,000 jobs generally and the quality of the jobs they have created is much poorer than the quality of the jobs they have lost.

What is essential is putting in place programs for youth. The member for Windsor West identified the record levels of student debt and that we need programs in place for youth to make sure they are given alternatives. What have the Conservatives done? The member for Vancouver Kingsway will address this in a moment as well, but they have gutted the youth gang strategy and crime prevention programs and the supports for our nation's youth. They are simply incapable of putting in place a strategy that is effective. It is all about partisan politics. If they really want the election they are pushing so badly for, I think their time of judgment by the Canadian public will come.

• (1730)

Mr. Brian Masse: Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up with the member for Burnaby—New Westminster not only in terms of investing in summer employment for youth but also the issue with regard to the cut in the gang file. Once again, Conservatives have money for a vase but no money for gang-related prevention work.

We have seen that being proactive and having police resources is a real advantage. Ironically, the government talked about how it was going to increase the number of police officers out on the street and never did so. It failed on that promise. Making sure it lives up to its promise of putting more police officers on the street has been very frustrating. At the same time, if they cannot do that, those funds could go to prevention. Gang projects are very important. Organized crime is a very serious issue. Why does the government not take organized crime seriously, as it says it does with its other types of initiatives?

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question. In fact, one could almost say that through the Conservatives' trade strategy they are fueling organized crime through the laundering of dirty drug money in Panama. They signed a reward cheque, a privileged trade agreement with Panama. It is the same situation in Colombia. The gangs there are affiliated with the government, and the government gets a reward from the Canadian government. It is absolutely appalling in both cases.

When we talk about youth employment strategies, anti-gang strategies and crime prevention, these are all priorities. They must be priorities in the justice system. What is the government doing instead? Because it is so fiscally irresponsible, it is throwing away \$9 billion for prisons that, according to the President of the Treasury Board, are being built so that people who commit unreported crimes can be put into jail. There have been enough jokes around the

country about that idea, the phantom prisons, the prisons for unreported crime. It is absolutely absurd.

If the government spent a fraction of that money responsibly and prudently, the way Canadian families do, it would be putting that money into the programs the member for Windsor West just mentioned, the summer employment programs, the crime prevention programs and anti-youth gang strategies. Those are the prudent and smart investments that an NDP government, if it were the will of the Canadian people, would make. The Conservatives are simply a hollow shell as far as concrete and practical approaches on crime are concerned. That is becoming very evident from their actions over the last few months.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to express a warm welcome back to you and to all members of the House. I hope everyone had a chance to spend time with their families and communities over the last six weeks as we broke from our activities in the House in mid-December and are now back to resume the people's business here.

The reason I start off that way is because today is January 31. This is an important day because it is the very first day that parliamentarians have returned to the House of Commons here in Ottawa after the break. We have been away for over a month, back in our communities talking to our neighbours, community groups and organizations, meeting with business people, talking to our constituents and getting what I think all parliamentarians would agree, is a thorough exposure to the fundamental issues facing Canadians from coast to coast to coast. Here we are back in Parliament on January 31, the first day back, and we are debating the very first bill that the Conservative government has chosen to put before this chamber.

Over the last month and a half I have heard, as have my NDP colleagues, of the pressing and important issues facing Canadians across this country. New Democrats represent ridings from the east coast to the west coast, from the Canadian border on the south to the high Arctic. We heard the same serious priorities of Canadians.

Canadians tell us they are having problems housing themselves. They are worried about their pensions, many of whom have pensions that are in crisis. They are worried about health care. Our seniors are wondering how they are going to pay their bills and whether or not they will get access to home care. Parents are worried about the cost of education. Students are worried about how they are going to pay their skyrocketing tuition and their mounting student debts, that is if they can get into post-secondary education at all.

People are concerned about the disappearance of good middle-class jobs in this country. They are concerned about how they are going to raise their families in the same manner they were raised by their parents and grandparents before them

Families across this country are worried about child care and how they can get quality, affordable, accessible care for their children while they go to work and try to sustain their families.

Victims across this country are worried about how their needs are going to be met. People experienced with crime prevention issues are wondering where their funding will come from. Organizations across this country that deliver social needs for every gamut of issue in this country are wondering how they will survive.

What is the Conservatives' number one priority in the face of all of these priorities, in the face of all of these issues? They bring forward a bill that since 1987 affects 187 people. In the last 25 years, a quarter century, about 187 people have applied under the faint hope clause in the Criminal Code to have their life sentence commuted to 15 years because they have rehabilitated themselves. The government is taking up valuable legislative time in this chamber to get rid of that.

The government does not want to deal with housing, education or home care. It does not want to talk about crime prevention or community safety. It wants to go after people in prison to make sure that the tiny, minute, infinitesimal number of people affected by this legislation are stripped of any opportunity to rehabilitate themselves at all.

Governing is about choosing priorities. I do not think we are going to get a more stark reminder than this of what the Conservative government's priorities are and how incredibly divergent those priorities are from the very real priorities facing Canadians and their families today.

My hon. colleague from Burnaby—New Westminster made several references to me speaking about the youth gang prevention fund. I am going to speak about that because it also reflects a sense of priorities.

The Conservative government stakes a lot of political weight on its reputation as being tough on crime. The Conservatives claim they are the party that stands up for victims of crime, that they want to make our communities safer. Let us examine a few facts about that.

• (1735)

The youth gang prevention fund is a program that is funded by the federal government. That funding goes to dozens of organizations across this country, with one goal in mind: to help keep youth out of gangs. In Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal and many other communities, dozens of programs are being run on a shoestring budget to try to divert troubled kids and kids who are at risk from going into gangs and going into a life of crime. The amount of money that is invested in this program: \$33 million over five years. That is about \$6.5 million a year. Our research indicates that about 1,000 youth have been in these programs; that is, 1,000 people who are being exposed to positive role models and who are being identified and worked with to help keep them out of a life of crime. Those programs, I am told, are oversubscribed and full.

That funding runs out in March. What do we hear? That the Conservative government is going to allow that funding to lapse. It can spend, by its own admission, \$2 billion to \$4 billion on building more prison cells, and of course we all know that those costs are vastly underestimated. Probably a more likely amount is at least \$10

Government Orders

billion will be spent by the government over the next five years for building more prison cells, but it will not spend \$6 million a year to keep our youth out of prisons. That is a striking sense of the priorities of the Conservative government. It prefers to talk tough, to have show, to play politics and prefers to issue propaganda and go after programs that do not affect anybody across this country but a small amount of people to try to display its toughness while millions of people's real problems remain unaddressed.

While the government is bringing forward legislation on ending the faint hope clause, let us talk about what people and Canadians really want us to address, as parliamentarians, when it comes to crime.

First, they want their communities to be safe.

How do we do that? Do we think communities are safe by keeping 180 people over the last 25 years from applying for a faint hope provision? Absolutely not.

Canadians would tell us they want more community policing. They want more cops walking the beat in their neighbourhoods. Community policing means a police presence in our communities, where we have small neighbourhood police offices.

They want, in rural areas, access to RCMP detachments where, if they phone a 9-1-1 number, they can actually get a response in an appropriate amount of time; unlike what the government has done by closing and allowing the closure of single-member police RCMP detachments in British Columbia.

They want crime prevention programs. Canadians want better lighting in our streets. They want more prosecutors and judges in our courts so that we can actually speed up the administration of our justice system. They want more diversion programs, where people who come into conflict with the law get actual help for the problems that are really causing them to act in a deviant manner to begin with; more mental health programs, more addiction treatment.

We need an anti-gun strategy that would stop the inflow of illegal guns across the border into our country.

Canadians want us to understand and acknowledge the obvious, which is that we have to address the social determinants of crime, which the government has never said a word on in the time I have been in the House. I have never heard a single Conservative stand and say, "I think that poverty, lack of opportunity, lack of educational opportunities, lack of resources in our communities for our young people are the breeding grounds for crime and criminal activity in at least some cases". I have never heard one Conservative say that. Conservatives are actually wrong about that, because the data displays that fact unbelievably.

Government Orders

We need more community facilities. Canadians want community centres, where they have recreational, cultural and social facilities where they can gather in their communities, particularly our young people, where they can come and play basketball, or they can learn a musical instrument, or they can take a language lesson, or they can pursue arts and cultural activities. These are the kind of enriched activities that our youth need to be exposed to, as opposed to being lured to perhaps illicit activities on the street.

But again, what do they get from the Conservative government? It brings forth legislation that would eliminate the faint hope provision from the Criminal Code. That is its response to those very real problems and concerns of Canadians.

● (1740)

Not only is that a factually unwise approach, but it is actually economically insane. We have already heard that no less figures than Newt Gingrich and Pat Nolan, hardly left-wing liberals from the United States, have brought up examples from that bastion of left-wingism, Texas, and in the United States they are actually acknowledging what we New Democrats have been saying, year after year, which is that increasing spending on prisons, putting more people in prisons for longer periods of time under harsher conditions, not only does not reduce the crime rate but it bankrupts the treasury. They are actually withdrawing on that.

States, from Pennsylvania all the way to the Carolinas to Texas, are all actually putting more money into diversion programs and rehabilitation programs. They have found that half of the prisoners released in a year under the old programs are back in prison within three years. They recognize that what they are doing does not work. They are recognizing the approach they took over the last 25 years, having their prison population growing 13 times faster than the general population, by spending \$68 billion in 2010 alone on corrections, 300% more than 25 years ago, has not done a darn thing for community safety except for bankrupting the taxpayer which is what the government will do if its policies continue going in the direction they are going.

Bill S-6, the faint hope clause, would, if passed, eliminate section 754.6 of the Criminal Code. This section allows for those serving a life sentence for murder or high treason the possibility of applying for parole after 15 years.

This faint hope provision was initially introduced in 1976, and the criteria for release and parole have been amended several times since. Presently the eligibility requirements are very stringent and include an appeal before a judge and jury, and unanimous approval of that jury before an appeal can even be heard by the National Parole Board.

According to the commissioner of the Correctional Service of Canada, Mr. Don Head, as of October 10, 2010, there were 1,508 offenders with cases applicable for judicial review. Since the first judicial review hearing in 1987 began, there have been a total of 181 court decisions. That is right, in 25 years there have been 181 court decisions.

Of those decisions, 146 resulted in a reduction of the period that must be served before parole eligibility, and 35 resulted in a refusal. Why were those 146 decisions positive in terms of the application? It

is because the system worked in those cases. The purpose of corrections is multifaceted. It is to remove a person from society. It is to punish them when they have transgressed against our rules of society. It is also to give them the services and functions that they require in order to attempt to rehabilitate themselves. That is what we want.

In some cases some of those people have taken that to heart, and some of those offenders have actually rehabilitated themselves. I am going to talk about why that is positive. When a person goes to prison in Canada, they are going to come out at some point. Just about everybody will anyway, 95% will. Of course people like Clifford Olson, Russell Williams and Mr. Pickton, in my home province, will never get out of prison nor should they.

There is a gamut of offences even under the conviction of murder. There could be crimes of passion, people who have committed crimes while under the influence of drugs and alcohol, and crimes committed when people are very young. We believe, at least on this side of the House, in the power of redemption, that sometimes people can rehabilitate themselves and change themselves.

● (1745)

If that is the case, if people can correct themselves after serving long sentences—and nobody is talking about these people not serving long sentences. These are people serving 25-year sentences who after 15 years can apply and maybe have their parole eligibility reduced by a few years. Those people can change and the law recognizes that. In the Conservatives' simple world I suppose they would argue nobody changes, but that is false because people do change.

I have been to 25 federal institutions in this country in the last year and a half. Correctional officers will say that the faint hope clause helps maintain order and safety in prison because when hope is taken away from people in prison, they are left with absolutely no incentive to act appropriately. For some people that is important. Guards will say that they like the faint hope clause even for people serving life sentences because it gives them an incentive, a potential reward if they act appropriately, and the government wants to take that away.

Friedrich Nietzsche said, "Beware of those in whom the urge to punish is strong". There is some wisdom in that. The government is playing politics with the crime agenda and Canadians are starting to have its number on this by the millions. They know that the government is pursuing U.S.-style politics and approaches to prison and crime that do not work, that will bankrupt us and that will not make our communities safer. That is the bottom line.

Seeing the priority of this bill before Parliament on the first day of the session illustrates that better than anything that I could say. Do the Conservatives bring a bill forward that would actually help victims of crime? Do they bring a bill forward that would actually build sexual assault centres for victims of sexual assault? Are they bringing forth bills that would actually build community centres that would give our youth hope? Are they funding education and making educational opportunities wider for our young people? Are they building mental health facilities and addiction treatment facilities so that we can deal with some of the most important underlying causes of criminal behaviour?

Government Orders

It has been estimated by all sources that 80% of people in our federal system have addictions or alcohol problems. Does the government address that problem? Does it say that it will put \$100 million, \$200 million or \$300 million into mental health and addictions treatment? That would help make our communities safer. If people in prison got the kind of treatment they needed, when they get out they would be less likely to offend. Does the government bring forth that legislation? No, it does not.

Instead, it wants a showpiece. It wants to look like it is tough. By being tough, it wants to remove a faint hope clause that is a carefully considered part of our criminal justice system that was negotiated at a time when we abolished capital punishment.

Maybe that is what this is really about. We heard the Prime Minister muse about being in favour of capital punishment, but the Conservatives do not have the courage to bring that bill forward because they know Canadians would not support it. They know Canadians would reject any party that sought to bring in a system in this country where the state started murdering people.

What does the government do? It goes after people in prison by removing the faint hope provision, one of the few things that might give someone who committed a murder when he or she was young the possibility of perhaps redeeming his or her life, maybe making things right for the victim and living his or her life in the manner that we all would want the offender to live. That is atrocious. In fact, there are stronger words to describe people who would pursue that as a criminal justice agenda. I will leave it as being uninformed, mean-spirited, insufficient, deficient and it will be unsuccessful at making any Canadian's life any better.

I would urge the government, if it is serious about crime, to work with the New Democrats and all members of the House to bring forth legislation that would address the social determinants of crime, that would make our communities safer, that would help our young people and anyone who has any contact with the criminal justice system and to work with the professionals in this country to actually make a difference in people's lives.

• (1750)

Mr. John Rafferty (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one of the things that will happen if the bill continues and one of the things I am most concerned about is the lack of discretion, the discretion that will disappear in terms of judges and juries to make the kinds of decisions that they know they should be making. For me that is a real concern.

I wonder if the hon. member would like to make a comment about that.

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I think Canadians are seeing, as they see the government stay in power longer and longer, that it does not believe in judicial discretion. The Conservatives do not trust judges. They do not trust prosecutors. They do not trust our justice system. They are trying to dispense justice from the politicians box. That is not only despicable but actually extremely ineffective and dangerous for our justice system where we depend on having an independent judiciary, where politicians are supposed to set the rules, carefully deliberate and pass laws to keep everybody safe, to govern our relations between each other and then trust others who are independent of politics to dispense justice.

Outside of the Supreme Court of Canada building, which is just down the street, is a statue of the traditional symbol of justice. It is the goddess of justice with a blindfold on her eyes and a balance in her hand. That is to symbolize two very important things: that justice must be independent, it must be measured and it must be judicious. The government is not interested in that.

The New Democrats trust in our judicial system. We know there are hard-working prosecutors. We know there are learned, astute judges who are sensitive and sympathetic to the community standards and who are subjected to rigorous appeal and scrutiny in everything they do. They dispense justice every day in this country. However, the Conservatives do not trust those people at all and that is why they want to take away discretion from our judges.

The essence of any justice system is built on discretion, because if people in this country were before a judge, they would want that judge to be addressing his or her mind to their specific situation with their specific conditions and what happened in their case. That is the essence of justice. We would not want ourselves and our life determined by some arbitrary standard set by a bunch of politicians in Ottawa.

• (1755)

Mr. Randy Kamp (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have one question for the member for Vancouver Kingsway. Has he, in his riding or on his travels, met with an individual who has had a loved one murdered and the murderer has gone through the judicial process a number of times to seek a hearing for early parole? If he has, did he actually listen to the individual?

I have person in my riding whose son was killed by Clifford Olson. He has talked to me a number of times about the incredible pain that he goes through for every one of these opportunities that this individuals takes knowing that he will never be successful but does it for all kinds of evil reasons, in my opinion.

I wonder if the hon. member has spoken personally to any of these people and what he thinks about what they have to say.

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that could have been the case because I have been told that multiple murderers are excluded from the faint hope provision. It is my understanding that it could never have been the case that Clifford Olson applied under the faint hope provision. However, the member still makes a good point.

Every member of this House, including members of the New Democratic Party, I argue most of all, are truly concerned about victims of crime and about the impact that any exposure to the criminal justice system has on them. Victims of crime do not choose to be the victims and, in many cases, they are the people who have suffered the harm. They are an important voice in the criminal justice system and we need to pay attention to their needs.

Government Orders

I would like to see legislation in which victims are given a greater voice in the justice system. I would like to see legislation that expands the concept of restorative justice, where healing becomes a better part of our system and where victims can sit face to face with their offenders, when that is appropriate and where they want to, where we can actually hear the pain of the victims. Of course, in any kind of process, it is important that we understand that victims will be sometimes traumatized by the process again and again.

In the case of the faint hope clause, if an application for early parole were dismissed for a lack of reasonable prospect of success, under the current system the chief justice or a judge may set a time for another application not earlier than two years after the dismissal. In fact, the judge may declare that the inmate will never be entitled to make another application.

The law already recognizes that victims should not be traumatized by repeat application and there are provisions in the law to deal with that. I think the member's very well-founded concern is more than adequately met by the law as it presently stands.

• (1800)

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the member.

First, what are some of the potential problems that could occur if this were removed? I am thinking of people in the jail system, in particular, by someone who has lost hope completely?

Second, could he just remind the House of the low recidivism or offence rate of those who have been released under these provisions?

Mr. Don Davies: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the recidivism rates first. I do not have the number right in front of me but I have seen figures that show that the recidivism rate for those who have been released under the faint hope provision are very low. In fact, I think it is two cases if my memory serves correctly and, in both cases, I think one person committed an assault. I am not sure what the other person committed but I do not believe it was a murder.

The application process that someone in a federal institution must go through to access the faint hope provisions is extremely layered and controlled. It has to pass a lot of sets of eyes before a person can even be considered for early release.

This is because the law recognizes that people change. People who commit murder when they are 17, 18, or 19 years old may be totally different when they are 31 or 32. To simply have a law that allows them the possibility of at least making an application before a judge and a jury and then a national parole board, go through all those sets of eyes and minds with data from their doctors, psychologists, social workers and from prison administrators so we get a full picture of that person, is something that benefits our society. It is the hallmark of any civilized society as well. We do not lock up people in dungeons and throw away the key, as is done in some countries. I think that is something that we as a society have to deal with.

Dealing with prison and crime is not a pleasant affair. Prisons are extremely complicated places. I have been in 25 of them, as I said. They are places of pathos, sadness and destruction. They are places of depression and unhappiness but they can also be places of redemption, growth and hope. We as a society need to decide what

we want our prisons to be. I as a Canadian want my prisons to be a place where there is the possibility of growth and redemption. The government and this legislation would take that away. I think it is bad legislation and every thinking parliamentarian should vote against it for that reason.

Mr. Bill Siksay (Burnaby—Douglas, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to participate in the debate on Bill S-6 on the elimination of the faint hope clause.

I want to start where my colleague ended on the importance of having a place in our criminal justice system where redemption and hope are possible, even for those who have committed the most serious crimes that we deal with in our society. The member put it very well and I do not think I could say it better or more clearly than he has. This has to be an important part of our criminal justice system and our corrections system. The bill would go some way in eliminating that possibility from our system.

Bill S-6 is back in the House. The last time I spoke on this issue was back on June 18, 2009, when we debated Bill C-36, essentially the same bill. The bill died when the Prime Minister decided to prorogue the House, once again short-circuiting the government's agenda on criminal justice issues. It was not the House that has slowed down the Conservatives' agenda. They have slowed down their agenda by using prorogation and calling early elections. They have not put forth the effort that it takes to get legislation through this place and this is an excellent example of one of those bills. They like to blame the opposition, but the reality is they have done more harm to the timing of their own agenda than the opposition could ever hope to do.

Bill S-6 is an act to amend the Criminal Code on the right of persons convicted of murder or high treason to be eligible for early parole. One of the good amendments that has come out of the committee process this time around is to eliminate the silly subtitle that the Conservatives chose to give the legislation. I am glad that is gone.

At the outset, this legislation, which eliminates the possibility of revision to parole for people who have committed murder or who are sentenced to life for high treason, is completely wrong. I am opposed to the basic principle of the legislation that claims we are not well served by this process of judicial review, in fact of citizen review, and that the faint hope clause should not be part of our criminal justice system.

I really believe we have been well served by the legislation and by the process. I believe it has encouraged rehabilitation in our prison system and made our prisons safer for both other prisoners as well as the prison guards and other professionals who work in our correctional service. It gives people the possibility of hope that they might be released early from a life sentence.

Government Orders

It has a very important positive effect within the institutions of the correctional system. It has also allowed for a measure of discretion to review the parole eligibility of people who have been sentenced to life in prison and it has encouraged a strong measure of citizen involvement in making the decisions on that very important process. However, in my opinion this legislation would seek to undo all of those things.

The current legislation and section 745.6 of the Criminal Code, which deals with judicial review, enables offenders serving life in prison with parole ineligibility periods of more than 15 years to apply for a reduction of that period. The review is not intended as a forum for retrial of the original offence. The focus is instead on the progress of the offender after having served at least 15 years of his or her sentence. That is how the Department of Justice describes the current process on its website. It is how it describes the intent of the current legislation.

It is important to review the process involved when the faint hope clause is engaged by someone serving a life sentence in prison. It is a very rigorous one. It is one that involves several stages. It is not easy to accomplish and everyone needs to appreciate the fact that there is rigour involved in this process.

● (1805)

The first stage is an application to the chief justice of the province in which the person was convicted. The chief justice or a designated superior court judge reviews the written materials presented from the Crown and the applicant. Then that judge determines on the basis of the written materials whether the applicant has shown on a balance of probabilities that there is a reasonable prospect that the application will succeed. If the judge decides that, a jury is impanelled to hear the case. If the judge decides there is no reason to proceed further, the appeal process stops at this point and there is no further follow-up. The judge, the Crown, the applicant all have a key role in this first stage.

The next stage is the jury. When the jury is constituted and impanelled, it then considers a number of issues when it looks at the application from the person in prison. When determining whether there should be a reduction of parole ineligibility, the jury determines the character of the applicant, his or her conduct while serving the sentence, the nature of the offence, information provided by the victim's family members about how the crime has affected them and any other matters the judge has considered relevant in the circumstances. The jury looks at a very broad scope at this point.

This is a panel of 12 citizens and the panel considers those factors and makes a decision about the reduction of the period of ineligibility. The decision of that jury to reduce the ineligibility period must be unanimous. We are not talking about a simple majority or anything like that. The jury can reduce the parole ineligibility period immediately, or at a later date or deny any reduction.

This is a pretty important process involving citizens who are engaged in this decision. That is a crucial thing to notice about this process. It is important to protect that point where citizens can engage in the criminal justice system, where they can engage in the corrections system and help make important decisions that affect the community, that affect other citizens, both victims and people in

prison. That is a crucial piece of the existing legislation. It is important to have citizens engaged in making decisions.

There are safeguards all through this process. The fact that the jury has to be unanimous is key among those safeguards in the existing process.

When the jury decides unanimously that the number of years to be served should be reduced, it can then decide by a two-thirds majority the number of years that must be served before the inmate can apply to the National Parole Board. If the jury decides that the period of parole ineligibility is not to be reduced, it can set another time at which the prisoner can again apply for judicial review. If no date is set, then the prisoner can reapply after two years for this process to be engaged again.

It is a complex process. The process initially involves a senior judge and then a jury of 12 citizens, two of the most important features of our system. Judicial discretion is involved. There is a strong citizen involvement component. The community is absolutely represented in the decision that someone's parole should be reduced.

That is not the end of the story because then the parole board does its job. The decision about whether the person gets out on parole is made by the parole board in the usual fashion. Here is another group of professionals who serve our communities admirably, who are engaged in this decision-making process, who are then engaged in discovering whether the person will succeed in the community and then help that person if he or she is ultimately released into the community.

This is not just a short-term parole. Anyone who gets out as a result of this process is on parole for life. That parole period never ends. It continues until that person dies. We need to remember again how important that is and how that offers protection to our communities as well.

There is a lot to this complex process. It is one that has served us well over many years. It originally came in during the mid-seventies when we essentially stopped using capital punishment. It was reaffirmed after the last capital punishment debate in the House in 1986. I believe it has been serving us essentially in its current form for about 25 years.

What has happened in that 25 years? What is the exact experience of this faint hope clause, of this possibility for early parole for someone who is sentenced to life for murder or treason?

● (1810)

New information came out during the course of the justice committee hearings on this bill from the Commissioner of the Correctional Service Canada, Mr. Don Head. He presented information that was valid as of October 10, 2010. He noted that there were 1,508 offenders with cases applicable to judicial review. That is the number of people in our system who could potentially apply for early release under the faint hope clause.

In the 25 years since the first judicial review hearing in 1987, there have a total of 181 court decision. In that 25 years, 181 people have applied to engage this process. That is not a significant number when we look at the total number who are eligible to do that.

Government Orders

Of those 181 court decisions, 146 resulted in a reduction of the period that must be served before parole eligibility and 35 resulted in a refusal. Already, the system has been weeding out the potential reductions.

Of the 146 offenders who had their parole eligibility moved earlier, 135 have been granted parole. Again, there is a change in the number. Out of the potential 146, we are down to 135.

Of those 135 who were granted parole, 68 have had no issue during their period of supervisions, 35 received a suspension because of some problem during their parole but their parole was not subsequently revoked and 23 had their parole revoked. Apparently a lot of those cases dealt with issues related to chronic offending against the conditions of parole, things like using drugs, alcohol, being late when there were restrictions on their movements, those kinds of things.

Seven of the one hundred and thirty-five who reoffended did it in a non-violent manner and two offended violently. Therefore, nine people reoffended out of the total number of cases that were looked at, seven in a non-violent manner and two offended violently. I believe a number of the seven offences were also related to drugs.

That is a whole other issue that we could talk about. We could talk about how our criminal legislation around drugs serves our communities, how well it has served us and the problems with that, but that is probably for another debate.

Of the two offenders who offended violently, one was found guilty of two counts of assault with a weapon and one count of assault using force and the other offender was found guilty of one count of robbery.

I am not going to make any bones about it. Those are serious crimes and serious issues, but these people were charged and convicted in court and are back in jail.

To put it succinctly, since 1987, there have been thousands of offenders who were eligible for early parole. Only 181 chose to apply. Out of those 181, only 135 received a reduction in their sentence. Less than 15%, in fact, of those eligible have applied.

Some of the talk about the legislation comes about because there is somehow this impression that we treat people who have committed murder in Canada lightly, that somehow we are soft on that crime in Canada and that people do not serve a lot of time in Canadian prisons for the crime of murder. In fact, it turns out that is absolutely the furthest from the truth.

It has been shown that the average time served in prison for first degree murder in Canada is 28.4 years. That is one of the longest average times in any country in the world. In comparison, in the United States, the average time incarcerated is 23 years. In many other countries, it is even shorter than that. Certainly in countries like New Zealand, Scotland, Switzerland and England, the average time spent incarcerated for murder is under 15 years.

●(1815)

The fact is that Canada does treat this crime far more severely than many of the countries to which we would want to be compared and significantly more when we look at the average time people spend in

prison. It is not something that we are being soft on. We are taking advantage of the possibility of incarceration. We are ensuring that people spend a significant time in jail.

There may be problems with that. Perhaps that is something we should be looking at as it may not be serving us well. In terms of the whole argument that somehow we are soft on crime and this is an issue that needs to be addressed by this Parliament, it turns out that is baloney because we are in fact much more severe than almost any other country we would choose to compare ourselves to. That is something that is also crucial to know in this process.

We have a process that we have had long experience with and that has been in place for over 25 years, probably even longer than that because it was in place for probably a decade before that. There were some changes made to it in the late 1980s. We have good experience with this. It is a program that has been successful, that has shown real and positive results for both people who have been incarcerated in our system and for the communities from which they come and to which they often return. It has shown that citizens can be engaged in a meaningful way in making determinations about their safety and the safety of their communities and decisions about who has been successfully rehabilitated. Citizens get to apply those standards that they believe are most important in making that kind of determination.

If there is a reason why we should reject this legislation, it is because it very clearly eliminates the possibility of citizen engagement in this very important process. This is something that has evolved over time and is something that we have shown great leadership in, establishing this kind of process that allows citizens to make important decisions about parole eligibility for people who have committed the most serious crimes possible in our society. It speaks well to our society that we both make that possibility available and that we also engage citizens directly in making the ultimate decisions about who gets out early, about who has been successfully rehabilitated. The process engages judges with discretion and engages a very senior level of judiciary in this decision-making process. That is also very important. It is important to give judges that discretion and that they exercise discretion on our behalf. After all, they are experts in this area. That is something that is also very important and a key aspect of this process.

As well, we must remember that the parole system continues to be engaged, that even the small number of people who do successfully complete this process remain on parole for the remainder of their lives and under strict supervision by the people who run our parole system.

Government Orders

I recently met with representatives of the parole system in my community. I was very impressed by the work that they do on our behalf in Burnaby and in New Westminster where the office is located. It is a very important contribution they make to the safety of our community and to the hopes of our society, that people can turn their lives around and be successfully integrated back into the community. It is important that we acknowledge the work that they do. It is very difficult work. They are often under great scrutiny for the decisions that they make. I am not sure that we always appreciate all that goes into an understanding, a determination of parole and that ongoing supervisory role that people engage when they are released from a correctional institution in Canada. I want to salute parole officers and the people in the parole system for the important work that they do.

All in all, this is a very flawed bill. It eliminates the possibility for hope, for redemption, as my colleague from Vancouver Kingsway so clearly pointed out in his speech a few minutes ago. We should be very cautious about eliminating this from our system. When we eliminate the possibility of hope, even from those who have committed the most serious crimes, we do not make our society any safer, nor do we make it any better and the bill takes us down absolutely the wrong course.

• (1820)

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have three quick questions. I certainly appreciate the member's thoughtful approach to this bill.

In the member's very last sentence, he said that he does not think it makes communities any safer. If in fact there were so few reoccurrences without this bill, maybe he could elaborate a bit on the types of the crimes that actually would be committed by the many people who lost hope or who have actually gone on to lead productive lives.

The second way we could see fewer victims is if the money saved by the huge costs of incarceration were used on more police or machines in hospitals. There are all sorts of ways more lives could be saved with the money that is saved.

Finally, could the member comment on the fact that the government would save a lot more people from becoming victims if it were to reinstate the crime prevention programs it has cancelled?

Mr. Bill Siksay: Mr. Speaker, I think there are many ways to make our communities safer.

We have seen clearly, time and time again, that crime prevention programs actually work, better education programs work, more opportunities for citizens work, and better jobs work. There are all kinds of things that make our communities safer that have nothing to do with keeping people in jail longer or putting people in prison longer.

We have seen that rehabilitation programs in prison work, but we do not often give them the kind of importance they need. We have seen that treating people for drug addiction often makes our communities dramatically safer, and yet we do not put nearly enough resources into that.

Instead the government thinks that it can be tough on crime and put more people in jail for longer, and somehow that makes us safer.

Even the Americans who were the champions of that kind of policy are turning their back on it. Some of the most outspoken proponents of it are turning their backs on it, because it just does not work.

There is proof, time and time again. There is research, time and time again. Unfortunately, that does not make an impression on the current government.

Those kinds of things are really important to all of us. The cost of incarcerating people could be used in so many other ways that would actually make our communities safer. We could engage citizens in other ways to make our communities safer. Restorative justice that engages people, victims of crime, people who have committed crime, representatives of the community from the get-go is a way of making our communities much safer. The government has no interest in that kind of program.

• (1825)

Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the speech from the member for Burnaby—Douglas.

Would the member comment on Newt Gingrich and Pat Nolan, two Republicans from the United States who, in their article, talk about what happened in Texas where it was decided against building more prisons and opted to enhance proven community corrections approaches, such as drug courts. Money was redirected into community treatment for mentally ill and low level drug addicts.

Not only have these reforms reduced Texas prison populations, but for the first time there is no waiting list for drug treatment in the state and crime has dropped 10% from 2004 through 2009, reaching its lowest annual rate since 1973.

Since even Republicans now understand the good merits of the NDP approach of being smart on crime, I would like to ask the member for Burnaby—Douglas why do the Conservatives not get it?

Mr. Bill Siksay: Mr. Speaker, if I had been told that I would standing in the House supporting an opinion offered by Newt Gingrich, the Republican to end all Republicans in some of our minds, and Pat Nolan, the Republican leader of the California State Assembly from 1984 to 1988, I would not have believed it.

I would not have believed that it would possible that Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Nolan would release the kind of statement that they have recently that says that they were wrong, that the approach that they championed, to build more prisons, to give tougher sentences, to put people in jail longer, the "three strikes and you're out", which I am sure Mr. Nolan was around for, that hideous attempt at justice reform. All of those things have only served to make communities poorer and more unsafe.

Here they are, turning their back and calling for the kinds of smart on crime measures the New Democrats have championed for years, generations in fact. It is really hard to believe that I could stand here and be on the same page as Newt Gingrich. My colleagues say that he has come to our page, and that is great. He has seen the light.

Adjournment Proceedings

It just goes to show that even the strangest people can be rehabilitated in their views of society, and that I am open to that possibility. I look forward to the possibility of somebody actually struggling with the numbers, the research and the experience of this kind of legislation, and then examining it carefully.

Mr. Gingrich deserves some kudos for taking the risk. This is a huge political risk for a Republican in the United States, to write this kind of statement and to re-examine something that he championed so vociferously. I think that is a very—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

[*English*]

STATUS OF WOMEN

Ms. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP): Mr. Speaker, on Persons Day last year, I asked the Minister for Status of Women why the government was undermining women's equality in Canada. She did not answer my question and ignored the fact that the government does not believe in women's equality.

The Prime Minister recently gave a speech touting his accomplishments over the past five years. Even though, in his own words, “it is a long list”, none of his so-called accomplishments even mentioned doing anything for women. Of course, it is because the Prime Minister has done nothing for women in Canada. In fact, the Prime Minister has turned back the clock on women's equality.

From the moment the Conservatives were elected, women's equality was threatened. The Prime Minister's agenda was to dismantle the newly negotiated child care agreement with the provinces, and the program was immediately nullified. The court challenges program was cancelled, and then came the restructuring of Status of Women Canada. The independent policy research fund was shut down. Regional offices of Status of Women were closed and women's groups which conducted advocacy and research activities were denied funding. Next came the Conservative attack on pay equity. The government tried to hide new legislation in a budget bill of all things. That particular legislation will destroy pay equity in the federal service.

The term “gender equality” has been struck out of the policy language of the government and replaced with ambivalent and less assertive language. Then of course came the news that CIDA would no longer fund abortions internationally and organizations that conducted gender equality projects abroad were denied funding.

It does not stop there. This fall, women found out that the mandatory census was nixed, and questions regarding women's unpaid labour were eliminated. Now, although promised and highlighted in the Speech from the Throne, funding to the sisters in spirit program has been cancelled despite the successes of the groundbreaking work done by the Native Women's Association of Canada.

Since 2006, Canada has slipped on the World Economic Forum's ranking in global gender equality from 14 in the world to an all-time low of 31 in 2008. When it comes to income gap between men and women, Canada falls to 33rd place, and women are the losers. The Conservative government also has allowed the number of government appointments of women to tribunals, boards, agencies, and crown corporations to slip from about 37% to below 32%.

The list of failures goes on and on. Canada should be a global leader when it comes to women's equality, but instead it is a global embarrassment. The government has purposefully and systematically dismantled programs and policies to undermine women's equality in Canada.

The wage gap between men and women is staggering. Women in Canada still face higher rates of violence because of their gender. Aboriginal women are 3.5 times more likely to be victims in violence than non-aboriginal women. We know now, from the sisters in spirit project, that more than 600 aboriginal women have gone missing or have been murdered. Senior women in Canada face alarming rates of poverty, and immigrant, aboriginal, and racialized women are especially vulnerable.

The government needs to take action now, or generation after generation of women will continue to face the same rates of poverty, violence, and systemic discrimination as our sisters do at this moment.

Besides handing out inadequate piecemeal funding to women's organizations across Canada, what has the government actually done to help improve the lives of women? Does it have any kind of long-term plan to advance women's—

● (1830)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Parliamentary Secretary for the Status of Women.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, promoting equality for women and encouraging the full participation of women in the economic, social and democratic life of our country remain priorities on which our government continues to work. That is why we have taken real steps to address issues that directly affect women. The measures we have taken include creating the universal child care benefit; increasing the pension income credit and modifying the guaranteed income supplement, thereby increasing the income of senior women; modernizing federal labour standards; improving business opportunities for women; taking action with regard to pay equity; launching special initiatives for women entrepreneurs; and increasing crime prevention measures, judicial measures and security measures to protect women and children from sexual exploitation and human trafficking.

Adjournment Proceedings

Our government also supports projects that promote the full participation of women in the economic, social and democratic life of Canada through the women's program at Status of Women Canada. The government has nearly doubled the budget for this program, from \$10.8 million in 2006-07 to \$19 million in 2010.

What does that mean for Canadian women? Here are a few examples. It means that women in Labrador are participating in a series of seminars on entrepreneurship, preparing business plans, marketing and business management. We know that in Canada, an increasing number of women are now among the best entrepreneurs.

It means that a number of women in Victoria who live in transitional housing are developing financial literacy and acquiring enough self-confidence to become independent.

It means that, through a mentorship program, more than 100 Toronto women who are victims of domestic violence are learning about the legal system, legal aid services, and how to work effectively with lawyers and get the help they need to live a very satisfying life in safety.

It means that 30 women with an intellectual disability living in Peterborough are learning to protect themselves, become leaders and actively participate in the life of their community.

Through a new program to promote diversity on boards of directors, it means that more and more women will be members of boards in our country.

These are but a few examples of the changes we are helping to bring about in Canada's communities. In fact, under this government, the women's program is now working on the advancement of all Canadian girls and women. Our government is promoting gender equality through positive action to deal with long-standing problems such as racial and sexual violence, participation in power and decision-making, as well as access to employment and education opportunities.

We are proud to rise in the House today to celebrate all these measures.

• (1835)

[*English*]

Ms. Irene Mathysen: Mr. Speaker, lots of words and lots of talk but absolutely nothing in terms of real and concrete measures to improve the lives of women in Canada, nor does the government have any sort of long-term plan to advance women's equality.

Today we learned that aboriginal women make up one-third of all federally incarcerated women in the federal prison system. That is a 90% increase since 2001. We know that women in prison are twice as likely as their male counterparts to suffer from mental illness and as many as 80% have been victims of sexual abuse.

Women in Canada are in crisis. Canada needs to recommit itself to women's equality. We have the tools, we have the reports and we have the know-how. What we need is political will. Unfortunately, I can only conclude that the government does not care.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Mr. Speaker, our government has worked closely with aboriginal women. Here are just some of the projects that help aboriginal women across the country.

In the UNiTE to End Violence Against Women campaign, the Government of Canada gave \$1 million to address violence against women. And the anti-violence campaign run by the Fédération des femmes acadiennes de la Nouvelle-Écosse was given \$180,000 for mentoring.

We are working together with communities—

• (1840)

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt, but you are out of time. The hon. member for Québec.

CONTAMINATED WATER IN SHANNON

Ms. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the court case related to the contaminated water in Shannon, a class action suit against the Attorney General of Canada, is under way. The case is meant to bring justice to several citizens from Shannon who drank TCE-contaminated water as a result of National Defence negligence.

I rise here today to denounce this government's contempt regarding its obligations and responsibilities when it comes to the groundwater contamination in Shannon. On November 24, 2010, I successfully forced a vote in the House of Commons and all opposition parties voted in favour of a motion ordering the government to produce analysis reports from the Valcartier military base's water supply system dating back to 1970, documents that the lawyers representing the class action suit filed by the people of Shannon have been trying to obtain for some time. That motion also received the unanimous support of the Quebec National Assembly. As we know, the Conservative government is an expert at refusing to honour the motions adopted by the National Assembly.

The next day, on November 25, the Minister of National Defence said that he would comply with the House's order to table those documents. He replied yes, and we thought those documents would be tabled in the weeks leading up to the break for the holiday season.

On December 15, since I had my doubts about the minister's willingness to table the documents in the House, I asked him again. The minister was changing his story and used the excuse that the matter was before the courts. As usual, he replied, just as the Liberals did when they were in power, that the documents would be released in due course. They have misled the people of Shannon.

I do not need to point out that we have yet to see these documents. I also sent a written request to the government for these same analysis reports that I mentioned earlier. But once again, the government, led by the minister, has acted in bad faith and almost completely ignored my demands.

Adjournment Proceedings

Instead of compensating the victims of contaminated water in Shannon, being proactive and helping them track down as many potentially contaminated people as possible, what did the minister do? Nothing. The U.S. Navy did the opposite. When something similar happened at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina, the American government helped track down the victims. In this case, what did the government do? Nothing. What contempt for the people of Shannon.

My questions today are clear: when will the Minister of National Defence make public the documents that the House ordered him to produce on November 24, 2010? The class action lawyers are waiting for these documents. In addition, will the government take responsibility for these citizens and try to contact as many people as possible to conduct analyses and obtain a full sample of those who developed a cancer that, in many cases, led to their death?

I have also introduced a private member's bill that is along the same lines. Will the government stop being stubborn and stop forcing the people of Shannon into a class action lawsuit to obtain compensation?

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you and I would especially like to highlight the kindness of my colleague from Québec; we do respect each other.

I would like to begin by pointing out the priority given by the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces to their environmental programs. The department is fully committed to carrying out its operations in a manner that protects human health and the environment.

Out of concern for proper environmental management, the department is correcting the environmental problems that arose in the past and is continuing to look for means of ensuring environmental health in coming years. That is why the federal government has spent almost \$60 million to improve and maintain the drinking water system on the Valcartier base. That is also the reason why the government continues to help the municipality of Shannon to improve its water network and conduct water quality studies in Shannon.

The Government of Canada, in particular, the Department of National Defence, Environment Canada and Health Canada, has been working closely with all interested parties from the outset and it continues to work with all stakeholders, namely, the municipality of Shannon, the City of Quebec, the Province of Quebec, and the residents of Shannon and Quebec City. In fact, an advisory committee was established in 2001 to ensure effective communication among the numerous parties involved, in particular, the residents and federal, provincial and municipal representatives. This committee meets every six months and is a useful forum for members of the community where they can work together to solve problems faced by the region.

The Canadian Forces test the wells on the Valcartier base on a daily basis to ensure that the water meets federal and provincial quality standards. An independent laboratory conducts TCE testing once a month. The results of these tests are sent to the City of Quebec, the municipality of Shannon and other stakeholders on a regular basis. In addition to these efforts, the department is also

working diligently to resolve the problem of TCE in the groundwater in the Valcartier region.

We took precautionary measures to prevent any further degradation of the sites on the Valcartier base and we are making considerable progress on the decontamination of those sites. In fact, for quite some time now, the Department of National Defence has had programs in place to identify the contaminated sites. It is taking all necessary steps to mitigate any associated risks.

Identifying and cleaning up all contaminated sites on the Valcartier base illustrate the Canadian Forces' continued commitment to protecting the health and safety of Canadians. We are determined to find solutions to this problem and we plan to implement them in the best interest of all stakeholders, but above all, for the residents of Shannon. We are very concerned about what is happening on the Valcartier base and we have taken significant measures to ensure that nothing like this never happens again. Since the matter is currently before the courts, it would not be appropriate to comment further at this time. However, I would like to reiterate that the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces do have environmental programs. National Defence is fully committed to operating in a way that serves to protect human health and the environment.

• (1845)

Ms. Christiane Gagnon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my Conservative Party colleague, who sits in the House of Commons and represents the people of Beauport—Limoilou, that the \$60 million she is talking about, which gave people access to clean water, did not just magically appear.

A number of questions were raised in the House and the members exerted pressure. Remember, the government was obliged to pay money out because it acted in bad faith on this issue. We recall the Radio-Canada report that condemned the attitude of the Department of National Defence and its irresponsibility on this issue. As if by chance, the minister finally decided to pay out a certain amount of money. And another thing I know about this issue and this money is that several million dollars has not yet been paid out to the municipality of Shannon.

My colleague may say that her government and the minister responsible for national defence are acting in good faith, but the citizens' committees were part of—

Mrs. Sylvie Boucher: Mr. Speaker, I am always pleased to respond to my Bloc Québécois colleague from the Quebec City area. It always makes me smile when she thinks that Bloc dollars are going to resolve these matters in Shannon.

Our government sat at the negotiating table and worked in partnership with the provincial governments. We held talks and we allocated money. We are able to do that because we are the government.

This is not about dithering and talking about people's health just for the sake of talking. We are here to take real action, and that is what we are doing every day for the people in the Quebec City area and Shannon.

• (1850)

CENSUS

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on October 5, 2010, I raised a question in the House, asking the Minister of Industry about the Conservative government's decision to abolish the long form census.

According to a former minister, the decision was motivated by the thousands of complaints that were coming in each day about the 2006 census. However, when Industry Canada tried to find those thousands of complaints, it turned out that only 25 or 30 complaints had been received about the short form census and long form census that year.

[English]

According to the Canadian Medical Association Journal of July, "With no consultation, the Harper government has undermined—

The Deputy Speaker: I would remind the hon. member that we cannot use proper names even if we are quoting. I heard the Prime Minister's name. Even if we are quoting from an article or something like that, we must remember to use titles or ridings.

Ms. Raymonde Folco: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With no consultation, the [Conservative] government has undermined evidence-based decision-making in Canada. For a government that made accountability a key priority, this policy choice is perplexing.

[Translation]

In 2006, this country had more than 32 million inhabitants, but it took just one complaint from Richmond Hill and an additional 25 or 30 complaints from elsewhere in Canada for this government to destroy a crucial element of public policy development in Canada. As a result, a radical policy change was made.

[English]

What is not clear is, other than Richmond Hill, did all the other complaints come from one town, one province or across the country? Were they all from Conservative-held ridings in Ontario? I am not aware of any person in my riding of Laval—Les Îles complaining and yet the government took such a drastic decision.

The Conservative government has now said that it will spend some \$30 million more than what is now being spent for a lower quality, voluntary national household survey. The data will be based on a response rate of about 50%. This is a far cry from the previous rate of 94% on the long form.

[Translation]

Witnesses who have appeared before the Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities have all sent the same message. I am talking about academics, community based researchers, social policy agencies and private companies. Their message was to leave the long form census alone and that abolishing it would hinder the accurate collection of demographic data on which Canada's public policy is based.

[English]

How does the government intend to set departmental plans and priorities with data from a voluntary household survey that will be

Adjournment Proceedings

sent to only 30% of households? Response rates could be 1%, 2% or even less since replies would be voluntary. Will this be sufficient information on which to base future policy?

[Translation]

The Minister of Industry must explain to Canadians how his government intends to evaluate such data over time. People who work in this field have indicated that this new method will not be an acceptable research tool.

[English]

A motion passed unanimously by the Northwest Territories Legislative Assembly October 29, 2010 also called for the long form's reinstatement. Aboriginal groups and people on fixed incomes have told us that without the mandatory aspect of this process, the form will rarely be filled out.

Surely in a pluralistic and democratic society it is important to listen to the voice of those who have spoken out against the government's decision to scrap the long form.

Will the government now do the right thing and scrap the voluntary household survey and reinstate the long form census?

Mr. Mike Lake (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member has asked if the government will do the right thing and the answer is absolutely yes. The government will do the right thing. The government will make changes so Canadians are not subject to fines and jail time because they do not want to tell the government how many bedrooms they have in their house or how much yard work they did last week. We think that is wrong. We made changes in instituting the new national household survey that changed this. I agree with the hon. member. The government will do the right thing and make those changes.

There is a lot to disagree with in terms of the hon. member's statement. The hon. member talked about one complaint from Richmond Hill. That is interesting. I have a letter from the member of Parliament for Richmond Hill who talks about receiving a few letters of complaint from constituents.

He says:

They are primarily concerned with the great detail of personal information they are required to fill out and therefore a potential invasion of privacy.

The hon. member talked about one person who complained. The member of Parliament for Richmond Hill, that member's Liberal colleague, goes on to say "I share this constituent's concern".

Maybe that one complaint that the member is talking about is her own colleague's complaint. It looks like there are more in his riding. That is why he wrote the letter, but she may want to take that up with the hon. Liberal member for Richmond Hill who is concerned about the great detail of personal information his constituents are required to fill out.

Adjournment Proceedings

In regard to the committee hearings, I may be wrong but I do not believe the hon. member is a part of the committee. I do not remember seeing her there. She has her facts wrong as well. Almost half of the witnesses who were before committee were in favour of the move the government was making. They may not have received as much coverage. Certainly Liberal members of committee did not listen too closely to what they had to say. They were not concerned with that. They moved a private member's bill to reinstate a system of fines for people who did not want to share information regarding their religion or how many bedrooms they had in their house.

We did hear from witnesses who thought the government's move was the right move. We heard from Darrell Bricker, who is a statistician. He said that he was confident a voluntary system could gather the same quality of information.

Speaking to what the Liberals have proposed, the Liberal member for St. Paul's has proposed a system that would institute a fine of up to \$500 for any Canadian who does not want to tell the government what his or her religion is.

The Conservative position, with a new national household survey, is to treat Canadians like adults. We still have the census where we require Canadians to fill out information on where they live, how many people live in the household, their gender, their marital status, those kinds of things, basic demographic information that most Canadians would acquaint with a census. We still have that mandatory census.

What was the long form, we are calling the national household survey. It asks questions like how many bedrooms in the house, how much housework someone did, how much yard work he or she did last week, how much time was spent with his or her kids, his or her religion. We are not going to threaten Canadians who do not want to answer these questions with fines and jail time.

Our positions are clearly different. The Liberal Party talks about the fact that most of the people who are unlikely to answer the survey come from vulnerable groups. We on this side of the House think it would be inappropriate for us to threaten vulnerable Canadians, such as a single mother living near the poverty line. We do not think we should tell her that if she does not answer a question—

● (1855)

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Laval—Les Îles.

Ms. Raymonde Folco: Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the response by the parliamentary secretary, I can understand why Canadians are very reluctant to give the Conservative government a majority.

Dissent is definitely not something the government tolerates. The government is prepared to risk the accurate collection of data for ideology.

[*Translation*]

What will the government lose? It will lose the accurate collection of data on our country's health, housing needs, educational needs, seniors' needs, the workforce, new arrivals and, overall, the need for federal programs. I see that the hon. member has not responded to any of those arguments.

[*English*]

On behalf of the people of Canada, researchers, community organizations and aboriginal peoples, we ask the government to stop this haphazard approach to policy development and reinstate the long form census.

Let us explore ways to meet the concerns of the reluctant few.

For every one million Canadians, one complaint was received by the government. How statistically significant is that number?

Mr. Mike Lake: Mr. Speaker, that is clearly and demonstrably untrue, as I pointed out in what I read earlier.

Speaking of tolerating dissent, let us talk about the Liberal position. For a new Canadian, for example, who tells an enumerator that he or she does not want to share what his or her religion is, for whatever reason that might be, the Liberal position, which we can read in the total refusal form that the enumerator has to fill out, states:

The information provided in the following sections may be used to support legal prosecution.

If a Canadian does not want to share what his or her religion is for whatever reason, this is what the enumerator has to fill out: "Description of the person who refused (e.g. age, gender, height, weight, other physical details such as facial hair, tattoos, glasses, birthmarks, distinctive clothing, etc.)". I would say that seems like a somewhat heavy-handed approach to take for dissenters who simply do not want to tell the government what their religion is. That is the Liberal approach, not our approach.

● (1900)

The Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, January 31, 2011

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS			
Economic Action Plan		Lynn Ross and Richard Hayden	
Mr. Menzies	7399	Mr. Armstrong	7422
PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS		Wearing of the Kirpan	
Patent Act		Mr. Bains	7422
Bill C-393, Report stage	7399	Joan Elizabeth Crocker	
Speaker's Ruling		Mr. Poilievre	7422
The Speaker	7399	Andrée Champagne	
Motions in Amendment		Mrs. Thi Lac	7422
Ms. Leslie	7399	Foreign Affairs	
Motion Nos. 1 and 2	7399	Mr. Obhrai	7422
Mr. Malo	7399	Ryan Russell	
Motion No. 3	7399	Mr. Dryden	7423
Ms. Leslie	7400	Public Safety	
Mr. Malo	7401	Mr. McColeman	7423
Mr. Wallace	7402	Youth Gang Prevention Fund	
Ms. Murray	7403	Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	7423
Mr. Masse	7405	The Economy	
Amendment to Motion No. 1	7406	Mr. Gourde	7423
Amendment to Motion No. 2	7406	Death Penalty	
Mrs. Block	7406	Mrs. DeBellefeuille	7423
GOVERNMENT ORDERS		Political Advertising	
Serious Time for the Most Serious Crime Act		Mr. Cuzner	7424
Mr. Nicholson	7407	The Economy	
Bill S-6, Third reading	7407	Mrs. Glover	7424
Mr. Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	7407	ORAL QUESTIONS	
Mr. Comartin	7408	Foreign Affairs	
Mr. Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe)	7409	Mr. Ignatieff	7424
Mr. Comartin	7412	Mr. Harper	7424
Mr. McKay	7412	Mr. Ignatieff	7424
Mr. Ménard	7413	Mr. Harper	7424
Mr. Ménard	7413	Mr. Ignatieff	7424
Mr. Szabo	7415	Mr. Harper	7424
Mr. Comartin	7416	Mr. Ignatieff	7424
Mr. Szabo	7418	Mr. Harper	7424
Mr. Atamanenko	7418	Mr. Ignatieff	7424
Mr. McKay	7419	Mr. Harper	7425
Mr. Lamoureux	7419	Mr. Harper	7425
STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS		Sales Tax Harmonization	
Constituents of Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette		Mr. Duceppe	7425
Mr. Sopuck	7421	Mr. Harper	7425
George Vari		Mr. Duceppe	7425
Mr. Silva	7421	Mr. Harper	7425
Incendies Film		Finance	
Mr. Pomerleau	7421	Mr. Paillé (Hochelaga)	7425
Canada Pension Plan		Mr. Menzies	7425
Mr. Marston	7421	Mr. Paillé (Hochelaga)	7425
		Mr. Menzies	7425

Veterans Affairs	
Ms. Mathysen	7433
Points of Order	
Oral Questions	
Ms. Neville	7433
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Lukiwski	7433
Questions Passed as Orders for Return	
Mr. Lukiwski	7460

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Criminal Code	
Bill S-6. Third reading	7480
Mr. Lamoureux	7480
Mr. Lemay	7480
Mr. Maloway	7481
Mr. Lemay	7482
Mr. Maloway	7483
Mr. Paillé (Hochelaga)	7484
Mr. Blais	7484
Ms. Leslie	7484
Mr. Maloway	7487
Mr. Maloway	7488

Mr. Rafferty	7491
Mr. Masse	7491
Mr. Julian	7492
Mr. Keddy	7495
Mr. Masse	7495
Mr. Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	7496
Mr. Rafferty	7499
Mr. Kamp	7499
Mr. Bagnell	7500
Mr. Siksay	7500
Mr. Bagnell	7503
Mr. Julian	7503

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Status of Women	
Ms. Mathysen	7504
Mrs. Boucher	7504
Contaminated Water in Shannon	
Ms. Gagnon	7505
Mrs. Boucher	7506
Census	
Ms. Folco	7507
Mr. Lake	7507

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and
Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the
following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les
Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à
l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>